

3 1761 06681355 1



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

Doc E. L. L.

DR 2. 1338

2 prob of corrupt

- working for us and
- symbolism

AN . 67 L 84 045

- pg 15 → Treatment of children





69

I

867 07

FORTY YEARS IN
CONSTANTINOPLE






THE AUTHOR IN 1915


FORTY YEARS IN CONSTANTINOPLE

THE RECOLLECTIONS OF
SIR EDWIN PEARS 1873-1915
WITH 16 ILLUSTRATIONS



138903
22/6/16

HERBERT JENKINS LIMITED
ARUNDEL PLACE HAYMARKET
LONDON S.W. ⌘ ⌘ MCMXVI



PREFACE

IN writing my reminiscences of Life in Constantinople I have been under the disadvantage of depending almost entirely on memory. When I was compelled to leave Turkey in the middle of last December I was unable to bring away memoranda and books which would have enabled me to fix dates, to give correct spelling of names of persons and places, and would have recalled a hundred circumstances, which without such aids I am unable to relate with desirable exactitude. This is all I have to add by way of excuse for any inaccuracies and shortcomings in my book.

I could have added many more reminiscences of visitors who have given me the pleasure of seeing them, some of them men and women whom all England delights to honour. Merely to mention their names would lay one open to a charge of sycophancy. To relate conversation with them would be a breach of confidence. If, for example, I should tell the story of one of our legislators who made all haste to get away from the city because he learned that Abdul Hamid proposed to invite him to dinner, and who gave as his reason for getting away that if invited he could hardly refuse, and that if he accepted he would lose all nonconformist votes, I should have to miss the point of my story unless I mentioned the name, which I should not be justified in doing.

Had space permitted, I should have liked much to speak at length of visits : of that of Miss Isabel Fry, who spent time and money for the benefit of Turkish women ; of the Members of the Balkan Committee, notably Mr. Noel E. Buxton and his brother ; Lady Boyle and Sir Edward ; Sir Arthur Evans, and others whose labours for the benefit of all sections of the community won them the gratitude of

Moslems and Christians alike ; of the veteran Frederic Harrison, who was especially honoured by the best men of the Young Turkey Party ; of Mr. H. W. Massingham, who shewed himself greatly interested in Turkish institutions. These visits were of great value to leading Turks and other members of the community as setting before them ideals of conduct and self-sacrifice.

Turkey has long attracted some of our best men and women. The singular devotion of Miss Edith Durham has won general respect in all the Western Balkan States. The massacres at Adana drew Lady Rosalind Northcote and several others to the aid of the victims. Susan, Lady Malmesbury, took great interest in the schools and colleges of the capital. Mr. Edward Clodd wanted to learn everything regarding Moslem and Christian education. The late Mr. John Westlake, a friend whom I had known from my Social Science days, always took great interest in the developments of Turkey. Another old and dear friend from the same period was Rev. Brooke Lambert, who stayed with me on three occasions, on one of which during our summer residence he conducted divine service in our *sala* at Prinkipo. Canon Malcolm McCall paid us two visits, and from the time of the Moslem atrocities in Bulgaria was always keenly alive to the religious and political questions of the Near East.

I have to express my very sincere thanks to Hariot, Lady Dufferin, for the excellent photographs of her husband and herself. I possess one signed by Lord Dufferin, but, like another of General Skobeleff and others which it was my intention to use, I have not seen my way to obtain them from Constantinople. My thanks are also due to Lady O'Connor for offering to place at my disposal a series of photographs of her husband ; to Lord Goschen for a photo which carries my memory back to the time when it was taken and the men with whom he had to act ; and to Beatrice, Lady Ellenborough, for permission to reproduce from her photograph the portrait of Jane Digby, Lady Ellenborough.

EDWIN PEARS.

London, S.W., Sep. 20, 1915.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v

CHAPTER I

I GO TO CONSTANTINOPLE

A Chance Remark and the Consequences—The Social Science Association—Pleasant Relations—I Start for Turkey—First Impressions—Bakshish—The Turks' Incurable Malady—The Comedy of the Buoys—The Tragedy of the Bridge—An Ideal Coal for the Navy	1
---	---

CHAPTER II

THE MOSLEM ATROCITIES IN BULGARIA

"Our Own Correspondent"—Robert College—Dr. Washburn and Dr. Long—The Bulgarian Students—Ugly Rumours—"Allah's Business"—My First Letter—Disraeli's Doubts—I Send Additional Proof—Incomprehensible Scepticism—Macgahan Sent to Investigate—Horrible Discoveries—Mr. Walter Baring Appointed Commissioner—His Report—Disraeli's Strange Conduct—Death of Macgahan—Conference of Powers, Dec.-Jan., 1877—Its Failure—Salisbury Unpopular in Constantinople—"Bravo, Sir Elliot"—Declaration of War by Russia, April 24, 1877	12
---	----

CHAPTER III

THE RUSSO-TURKISH WAR

The Russo-Turkish War Begins—Battle of Shenova—British Fleet in Besika Bay—British Colony Still Hostile—British Fleet at Prinkipo—Leaves Turkey—Did Arrival of British Fleet Prevent Russian Occupation?—Baker Pasha and Suliman—Skobeleff and the Taking of Constantinople—My Visit to Him in Camp—Remarkable Unanswered Telegram to Czar—Personal Reminiscences—Fellow Correspondents, Galenga, George Augustus Sala—A Correspondent Impostor—Remarkable Solution of a Prize Case	25
---	----

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IV

EAST AND WEST

	PAGE
The Anti-Russian British Colony—An Address to Sir Henry Elliot— I Protest—Journalism Extraordinary—Mr. Layard Becomes Ambassador—The Marquess of Bath—"A Year Behind the Fair"—Mr. W. E. Forster—A Grand Vizier's Rudeness—Mr. Hughes's Revenge—"The Only Gentleman in Europe"—British Tommies and a Turkish Toll Collector—Gallantry and Death— A Strange Court Scene—The Scots at Hasskewi—How a Lawyer Cannot be a Jackass - - - - -	43

CHAPTER V

THE REVOLUTION OF 1876

Turkey's Finances—Heavy Losses—The Moral Effect—Outcry Against the Sultan's Extravagance—His Passion for Building— Abdul Aziz a Prisoner—His Suicide—A Committee of Examination— The Trial of Ministers—The Tradition of the Turkish Palace—Murad Ascends the Throne—He is Deposed and Suc- ceeded by Abdul Hamid—The Question of a Constitution—A Revelation of Abuses—The New Form of Government—A Blunt Speaker—The Traditional Method—A Question of Right or Wrong - - - - -	52
--	----

CHAPTER VI

ARCHÆOLOGICAL INTERESTS AND LADY ELLENBOROUGH

Dr. Paspates and Dr. Schliemann—My First Visit to the Patriarchal Church—An Impressive Ceremony—The Greek Tradition—The Site of Troy—Interesting Discoveries—Visits to Nicaea—A Visit to Damascus—I Meet the Sheik's Wife—A Remarkable Woman —A Queen of the Desert—Life in the Harem—An Arab Invasion —The Bedouins' Devotion - - - - -	62
---	----

CHAPTER VII

THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION

The Arrival of Sir Henry Layard—Russophobia—Ideals About the Turk—A Scheme of Reform—Sir Henry Disillusioned—Glad- stone's Greek Letter—A Scandal—The Khedive's Extravagance —Egypt's Finances—Dual Control—The Succession Changed— The Khedive Deposed—Turkish Alarm—Saving the Sultan's Face—Mr. Goschen Succeeds Sir Henry Layard—Bismarck's Rudeness—The Sultan Obdurate—Mr. Goschen's Victory—The Murder of Colonel Cumaroff - - - - -	75
--	----

CHAPTER VIII

EGYPT

Lord Dufferin Appointed Ambassador—The Revolt of Arabi Pasha —Turkish Pin-pricks—The Bombardment of Alexandria—Tel- el-Kebir—The British Left to Restore Order—Turkey's Help
--

CONTENTS

ix

PAGE

Solicited—The Sultan's Refusal—Baker Pasha's Anxiety—Mr. Gladstone Determined—British Troops Land—Lord and Lady Dufferin's Services to the European Colony—The Girls' High School—Lady Dufferin's Popularity—A Courteous but Strong Ambassador—A Broad-minded Man	- - - - - - -	87
---	---------------------------------	----

CHAPTER IX

ABDUL HAMID

The Sultan's Superstition—Abdul Hamid's Hostility to Armenians—The Turkish Law of Succession—Its Disadvantages—Abdul Hamid's Uprising—A Narrow Environment—The Fleet Neglected—Abdul Hamid's Sensitiveness to Criticism—An Unofficial Censorship—A Continuous Foreign Policy—An Avengement for the Evacuation of Egypt—The Sultan Refuses His Consent—Lord Salisbury's Rejoinder—A Prosperous Egypt—Izzet Pasha—The Two Secretaries—Belief in Astrologers—The Tabah Affair—The Sultan's "Diplomatic Victory"—A Suspicious Monarch—An Elaborate Spying System—Blackmail—The Censors Regard Me as Incurable—I am Threatened with Expulsion—Turkish "Decorations"—A Clever Fraud	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	102
---	--	-----

CHAPTER X

ARMINIUS VAMBERY AND ABDUL HAMID

Père Hyacinthe—Women without Souls—The Khedive's Dictum—"Free Speech" in Turkey—The Sultan's Interference—Sir Henry Bulwer and Platæa—His Dummy Library—Arminius Vambery—A Chance Encounter—A Polyglot Gentleman—Vambery's Advice to Abdul Hamid—The Sultan's Anger—A Suppressed Book—The White Slave Traffic—A Courageous Englishwoman—An American's Mistake—A Splendid Work	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	121
---	---	-----

CHAPTER XI

THE SULTAN'S SUMMONS

Sir Edward Thornton—Mr. Sunset Cox—A Brilliant Speaker—Sir William White—His Friendship with Dr. Washburn—The Sultan Sends for Me—The Ideal Dragoman—I Refuse a Decoration—Haji Ali's Astonishment—The Sultan Persists—The Secretary's Ignorance—A Visit from a Spy—The Decoration Again Offered—A Significant Hint—The Value of a Turkish Decoration—The Order of the Mejidieh Conferred on a Fighting Cock	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	134
--	--	-----

CHAPTER XII

THE ARMENIAN MASSACRES

Popularity of "The Bosphorus Bull"—The Sacredness of the Sultan's <i>Tougra</i> —Baron Calice's Subtlety—Sir Philip Currie—Turkish Tobacco—The Armenians and Their Culture—Lord Byron and Their Tongue—The Desire for Education—Palmerston's Epigram—The "Yes Sirs"—Abdul Hamid and the Murdered Turk—An	- - - - - - - - - - -
--	---

Armenian Tragedy—The Sultan's Resolve—Organised Massacre—A Terrible List of Victims—Death or Conversion—An Armenian's Report—A Great Outcry—Mr. Gordon Bennett in Constantinople—The <i>New York Herald's</i> Investigations—Abdul Hamid's Mistake—Mr. Hepworth's and Mr. Fitzmaurice's Reports—"Voluntary" Conversions—The Massacre in Urfa Cathedral	144
--	-----

CHAPTER XIII

THE TURKISH METHOD

Turkish Fleet Neglected, but Added to Under Strange Circumstances—Kutchuk Said Takes Refuge at British Embassy—Is Protected by Sir Philip Currie—Girding on the Sword of Osman—Hamdi Bey—Allaverdi—Bishop Wordsworth's Visit—Lady Currie's Popularity—A Cultured Woman—The Spy's Invitation—The Young Turks' Indiscretion—The Secretary's Dilemma—A Counter Offensive—An Uncompromising Retort—Espionage—The Englishmen and the Female Spy—The Armenian Patriarch—An Impressive Ceremony—The Patriarch's Cordiality	170
---	-----

CHAPTER XIV

SIR NICHOLAS O'CONOR

Sir Nicholas O'Connor at Constantinople—Our Meeting at Sofia—Stambuloff Sends for Me—My Lost Luggage—I Enter the Palace Looking Like a Brigand—Stambuloff Comes to See me Off—The State of Macedonia—Robber Chiefs as Protectors—Exodus of the Inhabitants—Hilmi Pasha's Reforms Shelved—The Rival Churches—An Appeal to Rome—The Eternal Question of Reform—Formation of a Revolutionary Party—Dr. Nazim's Adventures	189
--	-----

CHAPTER XV

BARON MARSCHALL VON BIEBERSTEIN

The Baron's Greeting—The Fire-eaters at Home—Fehim Effendi's Escapades—Abdul Hamid's Protection—The German Ambassador's Ultimatum—Fehim's Banishment and Death—Sir Nicholas O'Connor's Thoroughness—Our Sunday Excursions—A Turkish Superstition—Hannibal's Tomb—Egyptian Affairs—Death of Sir Nicholas O'Connor—The Kaiser's Protest—Baron Marschall's Methods—A "Thorough" Man	205
--	-----

CHAPTER XVI

THE REVOLUTION OF 1908

Secret Committees—Sir Philip Currie's Anger—Turkish Procrastination—The Sick Man of Europe—Abdul Hamid a Bar to Telephones—Condition of Army and Navy—Ignorant Officers—Disaffection General—The Salonica Committee—Methods of Secrecy—The Third Army Corps—Enver and Niazi in Revolt—The End

CONTENTS

xi

PAGE

Approaching—Corruption and Tyranny—Espionage Everywhere—Turkish Women Involved—The First Shot—The Decision of the Fetva Eminé—The Troops Refuse to Fight—Wholesale Promotions—Afraid to Tell Abdul—The Court Astrologer Requisitioned—The Sultan Bows to the Storm—A Wave of Popularity—Spies Abolished and Liberty Proclaimed—General Rejoicing	218
--	-----

CHAPTER XVII

THE YOUNG TURKS IN POWER

Popularity of Great Britain—The Waring Guard—Great Britain's Disinterestedness—Abdul Hamid's Oath—Prisoners Released—A Grave Mistake—Ugly Rumours—A New Ministry Under Kiamil—Abdul Hamid and the Kaiser's Letter—Success of the Revolution—The Palace Staff—Abdul Hamid's Orders—Von der Goltz suspected—Turks' Vagueness as to the Constitution—I visit the Sheik-ul-Islam—A Remarkable Man—The Secret Methods of the C.U.P.—A People Transformed—An American Lady's Adventure—"Yasak"—A Precipitated Revolution—The Austrians and the Albanians—A Difficult Situation—The Sultan's Favourites	239
--	-----

CHAPTER XVIII

THE COUNTER REVOLUTION OF APRIL 13, 1909

The Unemployed—Turkish Anti-Semitism—Javad Bey Appointed Minister of Finance—The Reactionaries—A Military Revolt—Disturbing Reports—The Sacred Law—Mahmud Mukhtar's Loyalty—His Flight—My Son's Prompt Action—Surrounded—The Dragomans and the Sultan—An Interrupted Turkish Bath—A Matter of Life or Death—Mukhtar's Escape—A Hail of Bullets—The Meaning of the Movement—A Surprise to the Cabinet—Nazim Pasha's Escape—Dissatisfaction with the C.U.P.—The Comedy of the Steamers—Absurd Anomalies—Turkification and Tyranny—The Nationalists—Official Murders—What Occurred at Salonica—The Army of Deliverance—A Systematic Counter-stroke—The Tables Turned—The Exodus from the Palace	257
--	-----

CHAPTER XIX

ABDUL HAMID DEPOSED

Enver's Significant Words—A New Era—A Precipitated Coup—The Sultan's Attitude—The National Assembly Decide Upon Deposition—Abdul Hamid Informed—He Pleads for His Life—His Cowardice—Mahomet V.—Abdul Hamid is Packed Off—Refreshing the Harem—The New Sultan Proclaimed—A Kindly Man—Defying Abdul Hamid—Turkish Misrule—Fostering Religious Hatred—The Caliphate—The Jihad—Bribes for Reactionaries	282
---	-----

STRUGGLES OF THE COMMITTEE OF UNION AND PROGRESS

	PAGE
A Question of Responsibility—The Adana Massacre—A Commission of Enquiry—Examining Yildiz Kiosk—Embarrassing Discoveries—Hanging Reactionaries—The C.U.P. Visits France and England—Javad Bey's Mission a Failure—The C.U.P.'s Blunders—Turkifying Everything—A Foolish Boycott—A Secret Struggle—A Jihad that Failed—The Sultan's Progress—A Severe Criticism—Hakki Pasha's Comment—A Struggle for Life—Damat Ferid Pasha—The Dogs of Constantinople—Their Unwritten Laws—A Terrible Fate—Great Fires in Stambul—Young Turks' Vigorous Action—An Insanitary Hospital—Fire Insurance Claims—The Turks and Life Insurance—A New Law—Absurd Clauses—My Drastic Excisions—Decentralisation—A Cumbrous System—The Gendarmerie—The Modern Woman Phase—Miss Isabel Fry's Work - - - - -	297

CHAPTER XXI

ANNEXATION OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Prince Ferdinand declares himself King—Reorganisation of the Turkish Navy—Difficulties with Albania—The Balkan League—Its Successes—Dissensions—Mediation of the Powers—Orthodox and Bulgarian Churches Agree for Common Action—My Last Interview with Marschall von Bieberstein— <i>Coup d'état</i> —Assassination of Nazim Pasha—Forced Resignation of Kiamil—Arrival of Sir Louis Mallet—Quarrel between Bulgaria and Serbia—Assassination of Shevket Pasha—British Relief Committees in Constantinople - - - - -	322
--	-----

CHAPTER XXII

AUGUST-OCTOBER, 1914

Lull Before the Storm—Turkish Ministers Favourable to England, Excepting Enver Pasha—Arrival of <i>Goeben</i> and <i>Breslau</i> —Constant Declarations of Neutrality by Turks—British Ships not Permitted to Pass Into the Aegean—Disadvantages of British Ambassador—Hard and Fast Rule Between Diplomatic and Consular Service—Irritation of Turks at Pre-emption of Ships Built in England—Constant Series of Attacks Against England in Constantinople—Finding Turks Would not Declare War Germans in Command of Turkish Fleet Bombard Odessa - - -	339
--	-----

CHAPTER XXIII

THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR AT CONSTANTINOPLE

I Wish to Remain in Constantinople After Declaration of War—I am Arrested—Imprisoned—Released by Intervention of the American Ambassador—I Leave Constantinople—Journey to Dédéagatch—Thence to Piræus, Malta, Marseilles, and England—Incidents of the Voyage—Noble Conduct of Mr. and Mrs. Morgenthau Towards French and British Refugees—The Y.M.C.A. in Constantinople - - - - -	354
--	-----

CONTENTS

xiii


CHAPTER XXIV

SHORT AND PERSONAL	-	-	-	PAGE
				366

CHAPTER XXV


THE PAST AND THE FUTURE

Among the Archæologists—Rev. John Peters—Professor Hilprecht —George Smith—Hittite Investigators—Mr. Hogarth, Mr. Garstang, and Professor Sayce—Distinguished Explorers for the Palestine Exploration Fund—My Archæological Work in Con- stantinople—Rev. Dr. van Millingen—Bishops of Salisbury, Peterborough, and Gibraltar—Dr. Spooner, Canon Shoobridge, and Other Clergymen—Visit of Mr. Choate, Ambassador, to St. James's—Visits to Renowned Historical Sites, Ephesus Es- pecially—British Colony in Turkey—Thoughts on the Future of Turkey and Notably of Constantinople	-	-	-	-	368
INDEX	-	-	-	-	381



ILLUSTRATIONS

	TO FACE PAGE
THE AUTHOR IN 1915	<i>Frontispiece</i>
CONSTANTINOPLE FROM THE BOSPORUS	6
SIR HENRY ELLIOT	16
JANE DIGBY, LADY ELLENBOROUGH	72
SIR HENRY AUSTIN LAYARD	80
GROUP OF AMBASSADORS AT CONSTANTINOPLE	84
THE MARQUESS OF DUFFERIN AND AVA	88
THE MARCHIONESS OF DUFFERIN AND AVA	98
SIR NICHOLAS R. O'CONOR	190
KIAMIL PASHA	244
ABDUL HAMID	246
MAHMUD MUKHTAR PASHA	260
NAZIM PASHA	268
MAHMUD SHEVKET PASHA	282
HAKKI PASHA	308
TALAAAT BEY	358



FORTY YEARS IN CONSTANTINOPLE

CHAPTER I

I GO TO CONSTANTINOPLE

A Chance Remark and the Consequences—The Social Science Association — Pleasant Relations — I Start for Turkey — First Impressions — Bakshish — The Turks' Incurable Malady—The Comedy of the Buoys—The Tragedy of the Bridge—An Ideal Coal for the Navy.

DURING the year 1872 I had worked hard. I was General Secretary of the Social Science Association, and in that capacity had edited its Transactions and its Sessional Proceedings, in addition to being occupied with its affairs nearly every day and on one day a week usually until near midnight. I had also become Secretary of a very important International Prison Congress, at which every nation in Europe had official representatives, and to which the United States sent no less than eighty. When the Congress was over I was unanimously requested by the Council to edit its Transactions. The volume thus produced, called *Prisons and Reformatories at Home and Abroad*, has long since been sold out, but remained for eleven years, until a further International Prison Congress was held in Europe, a standing book of reference. During the same year I was editor of the *Law Magazine*, to whose pages I largely contributed. I wrote various articles for the *School Board Chronicle* and for other papers. I had become a Member of the North Eastern Circuit, and was beginning to acquire practice in England.

I was working too hard and felt that my health was giving way.

In January, 1873, I was at dinner at Hampstead with the late Frederic Hill, a man who, like his brothers, Sir Rowland and Mr. Matthew Davenport Hill, was always keenly interested in certain branches of Social Science. Taking in Mr. Hill's daughter to dinner, who was then Mrs. (now Lady) Scott, I enquired after the absence of her husband. She informed me he was remaining at home in order to examine two sets of papers, one regarding an opening at the Bar in Constantinople, and the other regarding another opening in Alexandria. I said, half in jest, half seriously, "Ask him to let me see the set which he rejects." Next day I received a letter from him, sending me a batch of papers and informing me that he had decided to go to Alexandria, because doctors had informed him that it would be better for his health than Constantinople.

I looked through the papers sent me, and found that an English solicitor who had taken over the professional work of Mr. (afterwards Sir Charles P.) Butt, who subsequently became Judge of the Admiralty and Divorce Court, had recently died and that a successor was desired. I had never been to Constantinople, but the prospect of a change of climate and scene for two or three years appealed to me and to my wife. I felt that I could not continue to work at the high pressure of the past year, and thought that by my work in editing, writing, and revising, I was drifting away from my legal professional work which I liked. I called upon an Irish Member of Parliament who had been established at the Bar in Constantinople, who kindly gave me particulars about the climate and work. I next visited Mr. Butt, who was practising at the English Bar, but who had been in busy practice in Constantinople for a few years. He gave the information I wanted and then told me the story of his having been in a great collision case in Constantinople and of his being opposed by Mr. Brett, who was already at the time of our conversation Mr. Justice Brett. This gentleman had

greatly approved of Butt's conduct of his case, and advised him to come to England, promising that he would do his best to get him appointed as his Junior. This had given Mr. Butt his opening. After a long interview, in which the already successful barrister treated me with the fraternal kindness that Members of the Bar usually shew each other, he advised me to get leave of absence and to go and give the place a three months' trial. Upon that advice I acted.

I applied to the Council of the Association for three months' leave of absence, frankly stating that I was going to look into the professional business which had been established by Mr. Butt, and that if it suited me I should not return. The Council granted my request, but with the candid expression of a hope by the most prominent members that I should not like it and should return.

As I did not return, I may be allowed to say that my four years' work at the Social Science Association will afford me to the hour of my death pleasant recollections of a number of devoted men and women who were the salt of London life.

The Association had done, and when I left it was doing, useful work. It had amongst its contributors not merely statesmen such as Lord Brougham, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Derby, Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Carnarvon, and others belonging to both the great political parties, but social reformers like Florence Nightingale, Miss Mary Carpenter, Sir Walter Crofton, Frederic Hill; political economists, of whom the greatest was probably John Stuart Mill, not to speak of writers like Matthew Arnold, F. D. Maurice, Frederic Harrison, Charles Kingsley, and a host of others. My four years' connection with it had brought me into communication with some of the greatest and most practical thinkers in the country. During the last year I was in England I was also Secretary of the International Prison Congress, where I had the honour of being presented to the Prince of Wales, and of making the acquaintance of Manning, not yet Cardinal, and of many distinguished foreigners, especially Americans.

When I decided to remain in Constantinople the Council

treated me with the same kindness that they had always shewn. In the Transactions of the Congress in September, 1873, the President of the Council commenced his address with the following words :

“ It would ill become me if I did not preface any observations of mine on this occasion with an expression of sincere regret for the loss we have sustained since our last Congress in the resignation of Mr. Pears. He filled the office of Secretary during four years with signal ability and with no stinted zeal, and the resolution of the Council passed unanimously after he left England, and which I subjoin, did no more than justice to the service he rendered to the Association.” *

The subjoined resolution was the following :

“ That this Council has received with much regret the resignation of Edwin Pears, Esq., Barrister-at-law, who has for more than four years filled the office of General Secretary with signal ability and success and to the great advantage of the Association, and hereby expresses its sense of the services of Mr. Pears and its best wishes for his future success in life.” *

I arrived in Constantinople in the month of March, 1873. The beauty of Constantinople from the sea and the Bosphorus was a welcome surprise. I have never grown weary of it. The city and its surroundings, the Bosphorus and the Princes Islands, have many changing aspects, but they are perennially beautiful. Add the charm of interesting historical associations and then I know of no place whose beauty is more fascinating. It is true that after I had landed I found the slummy and narrow streets a sad contrast to what I had seen before landing. The street dogs were everywhere. Street carriages had only just been introduced, and a carriage road opened from Galata, the commercial portion, to the heights of Pera, the residential portion for Europeans.

* Extracts from the Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. 1873.

When I arrived in Constantinople there was a lull in diplomatic strife. The Treaty of Paris (1856), whereby it was provided that neither Turkey nor Russia should build or maintain warships in the Black Sea, and still more the Franco-German war, had given rise to the Czar's circular (1870) declaring that he could no longer consider himself bound by that treaty so far as it affected his sovereign rights in the Black Sea. Public opinion had flamed up and war had been freely discussed. However, things resumed their normal state as a result of the conference held in London, where it was agreed that the clause relating to the Black Sea should be cancelled and that the Sultan should be empowered to open the Dardanelles, under certain restrictions as to guns and the number of vessels, to armed ships of friendly states in the event of his rights under the Treaty of Paris being threatened.

During the first eighteen months of my residence I began to realise what was the political condition of the Turkish Government and the attitude of the European, and especially of the British colony, towards the Government. I found myself in a new world with curiously distorted old-world notions, a world which in political matters did not know that any nation or even individuals had ideals or other incentives to action than the meanest form of self-interest. I soon discovered that the Government was honeycombed with corruption. No one seemed to contemplate that any business could be done with it except by bribery, and the open manner in which such form of corruption was spoken of was startling. Every official was regarded as having his price. In every contract that was made, an essential consideration was what amount would have to be paid as "bakshish."

I found in answer to my remonstrances on various occasions with reference to these bribes, that natives and foreigners usually drew a curious distinction between a present and a bribe. A man would point out that he was not giving a sum of money, be it five or five hundred pounds, to an official as a bribe, because the bargain or contract

that he was making was perfectly honest and the present was not given until after it was concluded. To my question whether it was expected that the official would consent on behalf of the Government to sign the contract if no present were promised, the answer always indicated the negative. But everybody did it and there was no chance of getting any Government contract unless such presents were promised. I soon learnt that the distinction between present and bribe was without a difference.

Even where Courts of Law were concerned most of the judges had their confidential men, and if one of these went to an advocate and told him that the judge considered that justice was on his side, but that his opponent was offering to pay a certain sum, it was soon recognised that the negotiation meant that unless the advocate would pay the same sum he had no chance of obtaining a verdict. On more than one occasion I have received a visit from a judge who informed me that in a case where I was professionally interested he thought that the arguments on my side were sound, but that he was very short of money, and he would be greatly obliged if I would persuade my client to lend him a certain sum. I can say with a clear conscience that I never acceded to such a demand, though I am aware that my clients have done so.

Everyone had stories to tell of the prevalence of bribery. Let me give two, because I know them to be true. The late Mr. George Crawshay of Newcastle-on-Tyne was a great philo-Turk. He belonged to a little company of men of whom the leader was Mr. Urquhart, an Englishman of eminence, of intelligence, and I believe of high character. His followers could not or would not recognise anything wrong about the Turk. He was the one gentleman left in Europe. Amongst those whom he greatly influenced, Mr. (afterwards Sir) Henry A. Layard was possibly the best known. The Turkish Government had decided to lay down in the harbour of Constantinople one hundred buoys, in order to avoid the constant collisions which were taking place owing to strong and varying currents in and near the

harbour of Constantinople. Tenders were issued for the supply of buoys with mushroom anchors and cables complete. Mr. Crawshay, who was an iron master, informed me that he intended to have the contract. He would estimate for them at a price which should barely cover their cost and which, therefore, no man who hoped to make a business profit could compete with. He did so. The contract was given to a Belgian or German firm at the price of £150 per buoy higher than that at which he had tendered.

But that is not the worst of the business, because when the buoys came to Constantinople it was found that the mushroom buoy had no orifice from which the air could escape, and I remember hearing Admiral Hobart Pasha, who was charged with the fixing of the buoys in the harbour, using very strong nautical language as to their construction. They were driven, said he, all about the harbour, and the anchors would not hold them in the position where they were laid. Mr. Crawshay was of course very indignant, and expressed his opinion that the £150 per buoy did not even express the full amount of bakshish which was paid. He fell back upon the usual excuse of the philo-Turks of the day, that the matter had probably been arranged by some of the Christian employés of the Porte. I admit that it may have been so, but the practice was so general that it is incredible that Turks did not share in the plunder, and of course a Government which was aware that its subordinates, Christians or Moslems, took part in such bargains, must bear its share in the responsibility.

Another incident was a surprise to me in those early days. A bridge mostly of wood had been built within sixty miles of Constantinople. The price paid was £8,000, which left the contractor a good profit and allowed him to pay a good sum as bakshish to the local Governor. When the amount was paid, so the story runs, the Governor expressed his satisfaction, "This has been a good business. Can't you find another like it?" The contractor replied in the negative, but he is supposed to have added, "If this bridge were to be burnt then a new one would have

to be constructed." Within a fortnight the bridge was burnt.

I have spoken of Mr. Crawshay as a philo-Turk. The truth is that at that time the whole British community, so far as I could learn, was philo-Turk. The glamour of the Crimean war was still upon it. The stories one heard of fortunes made and lost, of the reckless way in which money was squandered by the British and French Governments, the extravagant habits of British contractors were constant topics of conversation. One of the leading merchants said to me when there appeared a danger of the outbreak of war between England and Russia, "Of course in such a case you will drop your legal business and make ten times the amount in commerce." There were unpleasant stories of fortunes which were lost during the war, and especially at its sudden termination. When the latter took place there were many merchants who had cargoes en route which they expected to sell at a great profit, and which they had to dispose of at much below cost price in order to pay freight. Under the advice of the late Sir Robert Rawlinson, whom I had seen before I went to Constantinople, draining tiles were imported in great numbers. He had described very vividly the hideous sanitation, or rather absence of it, in which he had found the barracks, notably those near the British cemetery at Constantinople, called the Selimieh. One shipload of draining tiles arrived after the cessation of the war. It was sold for a mere trifle and the buyer hired land on which to deposit the tiles, paid for the land out of the sale of a portion of the cargo, and built himself a house and pocketed a good sum from the sale of the remainder.

One other Crimean story from an old resident is worth telling. He was supplying the British Fleet with coal, and I have no doubt did it honestly and well. A commissariat officer on one occasion went to him to say that a man-of-war had just arrived in the Bosphorus and was proceeding to the Crimea with distinguished officers on board, but was short of coal. The resident answered he had a small sailing-vessel

which had just arrived with a cargo of coal, and it was arranged with the commissariat officer that the sailing-vessel should discharge directly on board the man-of-war. This was done. When the resident saw his managing man he asked what had been done with about ninety kegs of gunpowder which had been stowed on the top of the coal in question. The manager said, "Oh, we found all the kegs empty. There was no powder to remove." It was interesting to hear the old resident tell the story of his anxiety during the next three weeks. He feared that every ship coming from the Crimea would bring news of an explosion on the man-of-war, and of an order for his arrest. He became ill from anxiety.

One day, a fortnight later, he heard with fear and trembling from his inner office the voice of the commissariat officer asking to see the merchant who had supplied the ship in question with coal. He put a bold face on the matter, but with fear and trembling. To his surprise the commissariat officer in a loud voice said, "Yes, you're the man. You gave us 300 tons of coal. It's the best we have ever had. Instead of our having to stop the ship while we cleared the funnels, whenever there is a new firing up, the smoke goes with a puff and clears the funnel itself. I want 300 tons more, but mind, it must be of the same quality."

It was during the Crimean war that an incident occurred shewing that, in spite of the Turk's prejudice against the infidel, he knows how to make good use of him when occasion requires. It also throws a sidelight on some of the difficulties that Christian missionaries have to contend with.

Turkey has usually found a difficulty in obtaining trustworthy interpreters in time of war, and there are many tales in regard to them, some of which are amusing. During the Crimean war the Turks wanted a man whom they could trust to proceed to Russian Headquarters and deliver an important communication. They chose an agent of the Bible Society who was distinguished from other men of the same name as Bible Barker. In order that he might pass through Turkish territory with the dignity becoming a special messenger of

the Sultan, he was given an Imperial firman which conveyed instructions or rather commands to all Governors and other Turkish authorities to render him every possible facility. For his safety and honour he had a small guard of soldiers.

On his journey, during which, as being in Turkish service, he wore a fez, he was formally met at every town by the local authorities, who treated him with the utmost respect. He spoke Turkish extremely well, and had no servant or attendant who spoke any other language. When he arrived at a certain large village he saw coming on the road towards him two men who were evidently Englishmen or Americans, and who had with them a bullock-cart heavily laden with personal belongings. He rightly judged them to be American missionaries. They were then nearly half a mile from the village, but already news of his arrival had been carried there, and the Caimacan and other local authorities came forward to pay their respects to the envoy of the Padishah.

Bible Barker's arrival coincided almost exactly with that of the missionaries. Barker addressed the latter in Turkish, asking them somewhat roughly who they were and what they were doing. They explained in the same language, believing him to be a Turk, that they had been in the village for nearly two years, but that they were persecuted because they were *giaours* by the young men, who constantly broke their windows, stole the produce of their garden, and would not allow anyone to come to their house. As they could neither teach nor preach they were going away. Barker Pasha, as their attendants called him, had halted under the spreading plane-tree which is so common a feature in Turkish villages. He asked for the names of the young men who had annoyed the missionaries. Half a dozen names were given, and the accused were ordered to stand forward. By this time nearly the whole of the population had assembled and the culprits were produced. All around had heard the conversation. Then the Pasha spoke to all present in terms somewhat like the following: "These *giaours* have come into the country from one which is the friend of the Sultan and by his permission. He lets them

come here to teach you because you are ignorant pigs and know nothing. They come from their far distant country which has good houses, green fields, and good roads, and where everyone can read and write. They wanted to try to civilise you. They are the guests of the Padishah, and you young scalawags, instead of receiving them with honour, have insulted and annoyed them and made it impossible for them to remain here. I therefore order and direct that all of you shall be sent to the army and put in the forefront of the first battle that takes place." He insisted very strongly that this order was to be strictly obeyed.

The young men, with their mothers and relations, cried out, "Amàn, Amàn! Mercy! Pardon!" and consternation fell upon the crowd. Thereupon the American missionaries themselves pleaded for mercy. They did not wish for revenge or punishment or in any way to do injury to the young men. They were even willing to remain if they were secured against persecution. The Pasha listened to their prayers, and then turned to the crowd.

"You see what sort of men these are. *You* might have pleaded all day long and I wouldn't have modified my sentence, but when *they* ask it I am ready to listen to their prayers. Only I release you on this condition. I charge you, the Caimacan and the Mollah, to watch over these American giaours, and if any of these scalawags or anybody else molests them in their work, send them on to me or to the Turkish officer in charge of the nearest station and say that you do it by my orders."

Thereupon the young men and the whole crowd thanked this generous Pasha, who, after taking some food to shew that he bore them no enmity, proceeded on his way, requesting, in Turkish always, the missionaries to go a little way with him. When only they remained, he went ahead of his guard so that he could converse with the missionaries, and to their astonishment addressed them in good English and disclosed who he was. The story adds that from that time they got on well with the people of the neighbourhood and became general favourites.

CHAPTER II

THE MOSLEM ATROCITIES IN BULGARIA

"Our Own Correspondent"—Robert College—Dr. Washburn and Dr. Long—The Bulgarian Students—Ugly Rumours—"Allah's Business"—My First Letter—Disraeli's Doubts—I Send Additional Proof—Incomprehensible Scepticism—Macgahan Sent to Investigate—Horrible Discoveries—Mr. Walter Baring Appointed Commissioner—His Report—Disraeli's Strange Conduct—Death of Macgahan—Conference of Powers, Dec.-Jan., 1877—Its Failure—Salisbury Unpopular in Constantinople—"Bravo, Sir Elliot"—Declaration of War by Russia, April 24, 1877.

ONCE well settled in Constantinople, I soon felt that I must have my say in England on Turkish matters. I had met Mr. Frank Hill, the then editor of the *Daily News*, and wrote to him covering a letter on the political situation and on the prevalence of corruption. In my letter to Mr. Hill, written, I believe, in October, 1875, I stated that I was already too busy a man to undertake to keep the paper supplied with news, but that if he chose to accept letters from me I should be glad to send them when I thought the importance of events justified me in writing. The enclosure shewed him what my opinions on the subject were. To that letter I never received a reply, but the enclosure figured in the *Daily News* as from "Our Own Correspondent." From that time until the advent of the New Constitution in Turkey in 1908, my letters often appeared in the *Daily News*.

Within nine months of the publication of my first letter events occurred in Turkey which made my name familiar in both houses of Parliament, and before the year was over,

through the influence of Mr. Gladstone, in all parts of the Empire. It had been my good fortune, within a few months of settling in Constantinople, to make the acquaintance of Dr. George Washburn and of Dr. Albert Long.* Both were men of great capacity, sterling honesty and broad-mindedness. Washburn was President of the American institution on the Bosphorus known as Robert College; Long was the Vice-President. I have described elsewhere the magnificent work which Robert College did for the Christian races in the Ottoman Empire, and is now doing, under its present President Dr. Gates, for them and for Turkish students also.

Dr. Long, who was my next-door neighbour while living near Robert College, had been a missionary in Bulgaria, and it was from him and from his writings, published in an obscure paper in America, that I first learned of the existence of the Bulgarian people. He was a man who exercised a large and sympathetic influence over others, and it was on his recommendation that a number of bright young Bulgarians were sent from their own country to receive instruction at Robert College during the early days of Dr. Washburn, who, I fancy, also gained his first knowledge of the Bulgarians from Dr. Long, and was soon impressed with the seriousness of the Bulgarian student. Thirty years after the time of which I am speaking he told me that they had kept a record of the progress made by the various students at Robert College, and for steady work and plodding industry the Bulgarians headed the list. At one time indeed, cricket and football had to be abandoned because the Bulgarian students took them so seriously as to interfere with the work of the college.

Probably there has never been a Ministry in Bulgaria that has not contained Robert College men. Stoiloff, the best-known Premier of the country after Stambuloff, was one of them, whose acquaintance dated back as far as 1875. Mr. Gueschoff, the Bulgarian Premier who resigned when the

* Dr. Washburn died in February, 1915, Dr. Long in 1901.

negotiations between him and Mr. Passitch, the Premier of Serbia, fell through, and the second war ensued, was also a Robert College man, and the two that I have mentioned, while possessing the native stubbornness of Bulgarian character, were distinguished by their moderation and by a spirit of sweet reasonableness that specially endeared them to English people. This was due especially to the influence of Dr. Washburn, whom I have on previous occasions compared with Arnold of Rugby, as one whose magnetism seemed to imbue those educated under him with the same kind of earnestness, of capacity for seeing both sides of a question, of taking each man's censure, but of reserving their judgment as did Arnold. I look forward to the time when we shall again see Gueschoff in power to the advantage of his country.

It was during the summer of 1875 that the Eastern volcano began to show signs of renewed activity. The Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina revolted and the Powers began to bring pressure to bear upon Turkey to establish liberty of religion (January, 1876). The Porte's reply was to defer payment of the dividend upon the loan for the public debt due in April. Disraeli stated in the Commons that nothing in the Treaty of Paris could support the idea that Turkey was to be upheld in her misgovernment. The Mediterranean squadrons of France and Germany entered Turkish waters as a result of the murder of their Consuls at Salonica, that of Germany being a British subject well known to me, whilst the British Fleet dropped anchor in Besika Bay.

Student riots broke out in Constantinople, and Midhat Pasha at the head of the "reformers" seized the reins of government, with the result that Abdul Aziz was deposed in May and was succeeded by his nephew Murad.*

In the spring of 1876 rumours began to come into Constantinople of a dark and ugly business in Bulgaria. The misgovernment of the country by the Turks was terrible, and even for Turkey unusual. The Bulgarians greatly

* With this Revolution I deal fully in Chapter V.

desired an education for their sons ; and those who had settled in Odessa and in Rumania, many of them exiles who had had to fly the country because they were teaching and were suspected of entertaining hostile sentiments towards the Government, wrote and spoke in favour of the education of their people. A veritable passion for education possessed the people. Finally the exiles in Russia and Rumania formed committees for political agitation, and some of them entertained hopes that the country would acquire autonomy.

The Turkish Government has never known how to treat its discontented subjects in any other way than by means of massacre. Persons coming to Constantinople brought stories of the murder or torture of school-teachers and of other prominent persons in Bulgaria who were supposed to be discontented, or who were found to be in communication with the committees formed at Bucharest and Odessa. Two of the editors of local newspapers in the capital spoke to me of letters which they had received which they dared not publish for fear that their papers would be suppressed. As the spring advanced, Dr. Long especially received a number of letters in Bulgarian, in which language he was recognised as an authority. These told a dreadful story. Orders had gone out from the Turkish authorities to the Moslem villagers to kill their Christian neighbours.

Let me tell of one atrocity which I do not remember to have published. A Bulgarian family of Moslems, living at Bebek on the Bosphorus, was visited by a friend of mine who was a doctor, or hakim. The head of the household was lying ill, stricken with fever. My friend was received by the poor distracted wife, who had already lost two of her children. She thanked the doctor, but spoke to him in the following terms : " You can do no good here, Hakim, because this is Allah's business. I will tell you how I know. We were living in a Bulgarian village and our next-door neighbours were Christians. The children of the two houses played together, and when I wanted a lettuce or the loan of a pan they were always ready to oblige me. One day my

husband came to me and said, 'Orders have come for us to kill the Christians, and I have to kill our neighbours.' " The woman's instinct revolted. She declared that they had always been kind and had done them no harm, and she did not care who had given the orders, they ought not to be obeyed. Her husband replied that he must carry out the Padishah's command. "Then," said she, "if you do, Allah will punish you. . . . He killed them all, Hakim, and I saw the dead bodies of our own children's playmates lying out in the field. Yes, this is Allah's business. He has taken away my two children, and he'll take my husband away. He won't kill me. You can do nothing to save him." Nor could he.

I collected a number of rumours and made much use of the information with which Dr. Long furnished me. At the same time, he and Dr. Washburn drew up a long statement, practically covering the same ground, which they put into the hands of the British Ambassador, Sir Henry Elliot, and of which they gave copies to Mr. Galenga, the Special Correspondent of the *Times*, and to me. That gentleman and I posted our accounts of Moslem atrocities in Bulgaria on the same day. Mine was dated June 16th, and appeared in the *Daily News* on the 23rd. For some reason, and much to the annoyance of Mr. Galenga, his account, though received by the *Times*, was not published. When my letter appeared it attracted considerable attention. Mr. W. E. Forster called attention to it in the House of Commons, and the Duke of Argyll in the House of Lords.

Mr. Disraeli was then Prime Minister, and treated the matter very lightly. He declared, in reply to a statement that persons had been tortured as well as killed, that he doubted whether torture was practised among a people "who generally terminated their connection with culprits in a more expeditious manner." He spoke of the Circassians who had taken a large share in the plunder and killing of the Bulgarians as "settlers with a great stake in the country." His light manner of speaking on the subject irritated Members on both sides of the House, who recognised



Photo.

SIR HENRY ELLIOT

Ellis & Fry, Ltd.

that if my statements were true they constituted a damning charge against Turkish methods of government in Bulgaria, and demanded at least serious examination. My old friend, Professor Hunter, in the House of Commons said that he knew me as a "slow-minded man, who would not make statements of that kind without being satisfied of their truth."

Mr. (afterwards Sir John) Robinson, of the *Daily News*, sent me a telegram reporting what Mr. Disraeli had said, and adding that he desired full explanations. Thereupon I saw various friends, and especially Dr. Long and Dr. Washburn, who furnished me with translations of a mass of correspondence, from which I wrote a second and longer letter to the *Daily News*. In my first letter I gave the names of thirty-seven villages which had been destroyed and whose inhabitants had been tortured or killed. In the second letter, written on June 30th, I brought the number of destroyed villages up to sixty, and stated that I had seen an official report which estimated the number of persons killed at 12,000.

It should be understood that at this time there was no revolt in Bulgaria, though there had been considerable expression of discontent. The idea of the Turks was to crush out the spirit of the Bulgarian people, and thus prevent revolt. In the two letters mentioned I had given the names of the sixty villages which had been destroyed. One London journal, which got into trouble with Mr. Labouchere of *Truth*, boldly asserted that the names of these villages did not figure in any known map. The statement may have been true of English maps, because the declaration of Mr. Schuyler, the United States Consul-General, was not without a basis of truth, that for the United States and the British Empire I was the discoverer of the existence of Bulgaria. I replied to the statement that the villages were as easily identified as if I had given the names of Yorkshire or Devonshire villages, and I urged that a Commission should be sent out by H. M. Government to make a report upon the matter. The publication of the second letter still further aroused

the British people. These letters, in the words of Mr. Gladstone, "first sounded the alarm in Europe."

Meantime, at my request, Mr. Robinson sent Mr. Macgahan, an Irish-American of great experience and fine character, to Bulgaria to report more fully than I had been able to do. There was no question of my going, and that for two reasons. First, that I was then fully occupied with professional work, and secondly, that beyond doubt difficulties would have been placed in my way by the Turkish Government; probably they would even have refused to give me the necessary local passport. The selection of Mr. Macgahan was a happy one. He was a friend of Mr. Schuyler's. Both of them had been in Central Asia and knew something of Russia, and neither of them could be charged with having any prejudice against the Turks. Mr. Schuyler went on behalf of his Government to make a report, and Mr. Macgahan accompanied him.

One of the first places they visited was Batak, the destruction of which had been mentioned in my first letter. From thence Macgahan sent me by private messenger a telegram, which came as a thunderbolt to the British public. Its contents were so horrible that I recognised at once it would not be transmitted by the Turkish authorities in Constantinople. I therefore sent it by letter to be dispatched from Bucarest. It was followed a day or two afterwards by a letter which I sent likewise by Bucarest.

"This letter, which was dated 2nd August, and appeared in the *Daily News* about a week later, created a profound sensation, not only in Great Britain but throughout Europe. It was at once a series of pictures describing with photographic accuracy what the observers had seen and a mass of the most ghastly stories they had heard on trustworthy authority. They had seen dogs feeding on human remains, heaps of human skulls, skeletons nearly entire, rotting clothing, human hair, and flesh putrid and lying in one foul heap. They saw the town with not a roof left, with women here and there wailing their dead amid the ruins. They

examined the heap and found that the skulls and skeletons were all small and that the clothing was that of women and girls. Macgahan counted a hundred skulls immediately around him. The skeletons were headless, shewing that these victims had been beheaded. Further on they saw the skeletons of two little children lying side by side with frightful sabre cuts on their little skulls. Macgahan remarked that the number of children killed in these massacres was something enormous. They heard on trustworthy authority from eye-witnesses that they were often spiked on bayonets. There was not a house beneath the ruins of which he and Mr. Schuyler did not see human remains, and the streets were strewn with them. When they drew nigh the church they found the ground covered with skeletons and lots of putrid flesh. In the church itself the sight was so appalling that I do not care to reproduce the terrible description given by Macgahan.

"Batak, where these horrors occurred, is situated about thirty miles from Tartar Bazarjik, which is on the railway and on a spur of the Rhodope Mountains. It was a thriving town, rich and prosperous in comparison with neighbouring Moslem villages. Its population previous to the massacres was about 9,000. Macgahan remarks that its prosperity had excited the envy and jealousy of its Moslem neighbours. I elsewhere remark that, in all the Moslem atrocities, Chiot, Bulgarian, and Armenian, the principal incentive has been the larger prosperity of the Christian population; for, in spite of centuries of oppression and plunder, Christian industry and Christian morality everywhere make for national wealth and intelligence." *

Mr. Gladstone, with the scepticism which rightly characterised a statesman dealing with allegations of so terrible a character as those contained in my letters already mentioned and in subsequent ones, and in the admirable letters

* The preceding paragraphs have been reproduced by kind permission of Messrs. Methuen and Co., from pp. 213-4 of *Turkey and its People*, written by me and published by that firm.

of Mr. Macgahan, hesitated for some time to make any public declaration on the subject. Mr. Schuyler had produced an official report. What is more important is that, on the pressure from both sides of the House, Mr. Disraeli's Government had consented to send a Commissioner to make a like examination.

Mr. Walter Baring, then a secretary of embassy at Constantinople, was chosen for the task. Sir Henry Elliot was asserted by Mr. Disraeli, quite incorrectly as was found subsequently, to have denied the accuracy of some of the statements which appeared in my two letters, and to have declared others greatly exaggerated. Hence Europe was aroused at the appointment of Mr. Baring. Many persons believed that he was named in order to put the most favourable aspect on the doings of the Turk. He did his work ably, thoroughly, and impartially. When on September 10, 1876, Mr. Baring's report was published, Mr. Gladstone concluded that the evidence upon the charges was complete, and shortly afterwards he published a pamphlet under the title of *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*. In this pamphlet he wrote as follows: "The first alarm respecting the Bulgarian outrages was, I believe, sounded in the *Daily News* on the 23rd June. I am sensible of the many services constantly rendered by free journalism to humanity, to freedom, and to justice. I do not undervalue the performances, on this occasion, of the *Times*, the doyen of the press in this country, and perhaps in the world, or of the *Daily Telegraph* and our other great organs. But of all these services, so far as my knowledge goes, that which has been rendered by the *Daily News*, through its foreign correspondence on this occasion, has been the most weighty, I may say, the most splendid." He adds: "I believe it is understood that the gentleman who has fought this battle—for a battle it has been—with such courage, intelligence, and conscientious care, is Mr. Pears, of Constantinople, correspondent of the *Daily News*."

The agitation due to the publication of Mr. Baring's report, and of other evidence, received an immense impetus

from Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet. Public meetings were held in nearly every important town in the British Islands, in upwards of a hundred of which I was thanked for my share in the exposure of Turkey's misdeeds. The agitation spread throughout Europe, and especially to Russia, where the letters and reports on the subject in the English newspapers were reproduced.

I should like here to do an act of justice. During this time, the summer of 1876, the late Sir Henry Elliot received a large number of letters and telegrams from indignant correspondents. These were occasioned not by anything which he had said or done, but by the conduct of Mr. Disraeli. On one occasion he, the Prime Minister, produced what appeared like a telegram in the House of Commons, and declared that he had a telegram from Sir Henry Elliot saying that the alleged atrocities were gross exaggerations, and adding words which created the impression in the country that Sir Henry was the defender of the abomination of the Turks and the Circassians.

To me the situation was puzzling. I knew that my friend Dr. Washburn had left with our Ambassador a copy of the statement which subsequently had been given both to me and to Mr. Galenga, and that after a few days Sir Henry had returned it to Dr. Washburn with the remark that it was a terrible business. I knew Sir Henry to be essentially an English gentleman, and at once wrote to the *Daily News* that I did not believe that our Ambassador had made any statement of the kind. Two or three years afterwards, when Sir Henry was Ambassador at Vienna, Mr. Layard having been transferred from Madrid to Constantinople as his successor on March 31, 1877, Sir Henry informed Dr. Washburn, who was dining with him, that he had never sent such a telegram to Mr. Disraeli, and that the importance which the public attached to this imaginary telegram placed him in the difficulty of deciding whether he should remain under the imputation of sending a message which Washburn and I knew to be a perversion of the truth, or should state the fact and thus throw the responsibility upon Mr. Disraeli.

Meantime the agitation in England had compelled Mr. Disraeli to take steps for the better government of Bulgaria, and other provinces in European Turkey.

A conference of the representatives of the Powers was called together in Constantinople on December 11, which Lord Salisbury attended as British plenipotentiary. Their object was to persuade the Porte to adopt reforms in the Balkan Peninsula which would satisfy the reasonable demands of the people and prevent the recurrence of massacres such as those that had occurred in Bulgaria. I believe every representative earnestly desired the maintenance of peace, and none more sincerely than the two ablest members present, Lord Salisbury and General Ignatiev. Salisbury desired it because he recognised that it was intolerable that England should consent to the misgovernment which had led to the Bulgarian horrors, and because also the emotion and growing hostility in England towards Turkey and against Mr. Disraeli's government could only be appeased by obtaining from the Porte a promise of reforms which if executed would presumably secure better government. Ignatiev desired it because Russia had always shewn herself sincerely anxious to maintain her rôle as the traditional protector of the Christian subjects of the Sultan, and further because she was not prepared for war.

Lord Salisbury arrived in Constantinople on December 5, 1876. He soon recognised that Ignatiev was the strongest of his colleagues and they got on well together. The Conference met on December 23. A project of reforms was submitted and was accepted by all the representatives of foreign States, except by the Turkish, but the Porte would have none of it. Praiseworthy attempts were made to modify the form of the demands so that they should be acceptable, but the Turk would have no reforms. He was told, with perfect truth, that Russia was the only country that would go to war for the Christians, that Russia was not prepared for war and that no other Power would support her. The Porte became the more obdurate as it found

that the members of the Conference were prepared to make modifications in their scheme. It was unfortunate also that there was supposed to be dissension between Lord Salisbury and Sir Henry Elliot, the latter of whom was represented as opposing his colleagues' designs. I remember one newspaper which came out with a flaming leader on these supposed dissensions, headed "Bravo, Sir Elliot."

To the regret of the members and of all the foreign colonies in Constantinople, as well as the sober minded amongst the Turks themselves, the Conference broke up, on January 20, after sitting for nearly six weeks, and Lord Salisbury may even be said to have been hooted out of the city. It was serious business, and many of us felt that it meant war.

On the last evening before the departure of Lord Salisbury, he held a small reception in the Hotel Royale, at which I was present. One incident remains in my memory. I was talking with Mr. F. I. Scudamore, a man of keen intelligence, who had been one of the secretaries of the General Post Office in London. We observed that Lord Salisbury was detained in conversation for a long time by Lady Strangford, a woman who had devoted much of her time to the welfare of the Turkish people. She was below the average height, and Lord Salisbury well above it, and the two figures would not have made a bad subject for the caricaturist, he listening intently, she speaking with great vivacity and earnestness. When the conversation ceased, Lord Salisbury came over to Mr. Scudamore and me and informed us that Lady Strangford had been employed during the whole time in singing the praises of the Turk, "but," added he, "she rather spoilt it by her last remark." One of us ventured to enquire what it was, and the answer was that she felt bound to admit that the Turk was destitute of capacity. "So," said Salisbury to Lady Strangford, "your diagnosis of the Turk is that he is a combination of angel and fool."

In spite of Lord Salisbury's clearly expressed intimations to the contrary, Abdul Hamid continued to hope for British

support and rejected the protocol presented by the Powers, in which were recapitulated their demands. He was apparently relying upon Great Britain's suspicion of Russia, and nothing seemed capable of convincing him that Great Britain would allow Russia to attack Turkey. The Czar, however, declared war on April 24, his declaration being made in a document of great dignity, and unanswerable as to its facts.

This is not the place to tell the subsequent story of Bulgaria, but before dismissing the subject I must say a few words about my colleague Macgahan. After Russia had declared war, Macgahan continued to act as Special Correspondent of the *Daily News* during that war. I should think that he was never a strong man, but in doing his duty he never spared himself, and when in the spring of the following year, 1878, the Russian Army arrived at San Stefano, twelve miles from Constantinople, he was greatly weakened by his work. Typhoid was raging, and I therefore proposed that he should live with me at our summer residence in the island of Prinkipo, a proposition which he gladly accepted. He was the delight of all members of the family, and especially of one of my boys, who knew almost by heart his *Northern Lights*, a story of his adventures in the Arctic Seas, where I believe he represented the *New York Herald*. The two would sit on the edge of a pond in my garden and construct fleets of paper boats and amuse themselves, Macgahan getting stronger every day. After some three weeks' stay he went to Pera, frankly against my advice, with the intention of remaining a few days. Typhoid caught him and I accompanied him to the British Hospital, where the best possible medical aid was given to save a life very dear to many of us. After a short illness he died. I remember General Skobeleff coming to see him as he lay dead, and crying bitterly over him. He also attended the funeral, which I arranged. Years afterwards Macgahan's remains were transported to the United States.

CHAPTER III

THE RUSSO-TURKISH WAR

The Russo-Turkish War Begins—Battle of Shenova—British Fleet in Besika Bay—British Colony still Hostile—British Fleet at Prinkipo—Leaves Turkey—Did Arrival of British Fleet Prevent Russian Occupation? Baker Pasha and Suliman—Skobelev and the Taking of Constantinople—My Visit to Him in Camp—Remarkable Unanswered Telegram to Czar—Personal Reminiscences—Fellow Correspondents, Galenga, George Augustus Sala—A Correspondent Impostor—Remarkable Solution of a Prize Case.

AT the outset both countries found themselves faced with the difficulties arising from unpreparedness, incompetence, and corruption. The Russians, however, crossed the Danube on July 2; a fortnight later Nicopolis fell, and the Shipka Pass was seized by Gourko. These sudden successes inclined the Czar towards the idea that peace might be near, and the British Attaché at the Russian headquarters left for London after having an interview with the Czar. In the meantime Osman Pasha had seized Plevna, an act that changed the whole complexion of the war. For five months the Turk defied the Russians and held up their advance, inflicting on them enormous losses. Fortune seemed to have changed sides; for a time the Turkish arms triumphed. Gourko was forced from the Shipka Pass and in Armenia Mukhtar Pasha drove back the invaders in disorder. Gradually, however, the Russian masses prevailed, Plevna was formally invested, and on December 10 Osman Pasha capitulated with his half-starved army after a brave endeavour to cut his way through the enemy.

After the fall of Plevna the immediate object was to follow up the Turks. The Russian army was divided into two parts. Gourko took charge of the larger and proceeded to Sofia. A more important movement was made by Skobelev, who executed one of the boldest moves of his career. Gourko had gone round the western end of the Balkans ; Skobelev determined to go over the range. On the southern side of the Shipka Pass an army of 80,000 Turks, under Vessel Pasha, was encamped at a place called Shenova.

The Pass had been strongly fortified after the retreat of the Russians, its great forts being those of St. George ; but to the right and left of the Pass, at a distance varying from four to six miles, were sheep tracks, known to the Bulgarian peasants. Skobelev set part of his army to make a feint to attack the forts in Shipka Pass ; Prince Mirsky was placed in command of the portion of the army which went by the sheep track to the east of it, whilst Skobelev took charge of that which went to the west. The lines of these two last Generals were so long, the men having to pass in Indian file, that when the first soldiers arrived on the plain to the south of the Balkans the last man had not started on the journey.

Mirsky and Skobelev collected their forces together, the Turks apparently thinking that the weather was too cold and the quantity of snow too great to permit the Russians to attack, except along the main high-road of Shipka Pass. After, however, Mirsky and Skobelev had joined forces, they attacked Vessel's army, and Skobelev told me that a bayonet charge took place which he believed to be the longest in history ; nothing was heard but the clash of steel during seven minutes. At the end of that time Vessel asked on what terms he would accept surrender. Skobelev replied, " Absolute surrender of the army and that a messenger be sent up to St. George to order the surrender of its forts." These terms were accepted, and before night closed 70,000 men were being bundled in furious haste northward through the Shipka Pass, from whence they passed as rapidly as possible to Russian prisons.

The Czar, in recognition of this daring and successful attempt, ordered Skobelev to inscribe the name Shenova on his standard. After this defeat the Turks were anxious to make peace, and sent parliamentaries almost to the foot of the Balkans, but without giving them full powers. The Russians refused to accept them as authorised persons, or to check their progress for a single hour. They pressed on to Philippopolis in spite of the severe winter. When the powers did eventually arrive, the Russians were within a few miles of San Stefano. This brought an end to the war.

The British Fleet had arrived in Besika Bay near the Aegean end of the Dardanelles in May, 1876. In the middle of February, 1878, it passed through the Dardanelles, and this without the consent of the Sultan. For some weeks it remained in the Gulf of Ismid, but when the Russian army advanced to San Stefano it steamed up to Prinkipo, where it anchored, the flagship *Alexandra* being immediately opposite our house. Daily we heard its bands playing that most banal of music-hall songs, which added a new word to the language, or gave it rebirth. The chorus was,

“We don't want to fight, but by Jingo if we do,
We've got the ships, we've got the men, we've got the
money too.
The Rooshun bear we've thrashed before, and while we're
Britons true,
The Rooshuns shall not have Constantinople.”

By the time war was declared the attitude of a considerable portion of the British Colony had changed. The residents were moved by the outrages in Bulgaria, were surprised by the outcry which the report of them had made in England, read attentively the *Times* and other English papers, and asked, were these reports true? Mr. Schuyler's report, followed by that of Mr. Baring, aroused their interest, and I no longer stood alone in denouncing the ill-government of the Turk. But much of the old leaven remained.

It is indeed difficult to exaggerate the curious feeling of hostility which had been shewn, especially among old residents, by otherwise reasonable men towards Russia.

Nothing that she could do was right. Her Ambassador in Constantinople, General Ignatiev, was spoken of quite commonly as the "Prince of Liars." In conversation a friend of mine alluded to this designation and declared that he deceived his colleagues by telling them the truth.

The colony was still under the influence of the impressions created by the Crimean war. The arrival of the Fleet somewhat increased this influence. Indeed, the colony itself was saturated with Rip Van Winkleism. The mails from England never took less than eight days, whereas during the last twenty years they have been running with fair regularity in three. Almost the only newspaper received in the colony was the *Times*, and when its numbers were received in batches of six at a time, and not unseldom, owing to bad weather, in batches of twelve or even eighteen, it will readily be understood that their contents were very lightly scanned. The same sort of ignorance and prejudice existed in reference to the United States, much to my surprise.

In England I had been a member of a committee, founded, I believe, by Mr. Thomas Hughes, and of which a prominent member was Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, then a young man, the object of which was to improve the relations between the two great branches of the English-speaking world. I found the Americans just as prejudiced against everything British as the British colony was against everything Russian. On an early occasion at a meeting where many Americans were present and something was said about religious belief, I created somewhat of a flutter by declaring that I believed in one God, and in the union of the English-speaking peoples, though I admitted that my creed contained other articles. I found, however, that the Americans themselves were curiously anti-Russian and pro-Turkish.

There is no one who has a higher appreciation than I of the work done by American missionaries in Turkey. Whenever such mission exists, it is a centre of light and civilisation. But I well remember that an American missionary who was the head of an important college in the interior came to me

with a remonstrance at making public the Moslem atrocities in Bulgaria. Like many Englishmen he told me that to do so was to play into the hands of Russia. I replied very sharply that if to expose such abominations had that result, then I should continue to play into the hands of Russia.

Let me in concluding this matter say that I soon obtained the confidence of the leading Americans in the country, and from that day to the present all have been my sincere friends. When I was expelled from the country in December, 1914, my wife and daughter decided to remain behind, and every letter that I received from them during the following months spoke of the constant kindness and numerous visits to them of "those dear Americans."

We saw a good deal of the officers of the Fleet, and not a day passed without some of them coming to our house. I formed a very high opinion of Admiral Hornby and, although his connections and even his position inclined him to hold different opinions from mine, he always spoke reasonably and sensibly. Many of the officers who were in and out constantly were, as naval men usually are, very good fellows, and several have risen to high distinction in the service.

During the summer of 1878 with its long negotiations for peace, Prinkipo had a golden time, for in addition to the men from our ships, every Sunday two or three steamer-loads of Russian officers from San Stefano came over to spend a happy day. General Gourko was one, and between him and Admiral Hornby there were very friendly greetings and apparently a sincere friendship. When, six months after the preliminary signature of peace on March 3, 1878, a great review of the Russian troops was held at San Stefano at about the middle of September, a party of officers from the Fleet, with myself included, went over to see it. We agreed to make independent estimates of the number of troops who took part in it. Our estimates differed greatly, some being as high as 150,000, the lowest being 95,000. We generally agreed on comparing our estimates that 120,000 would represent those who took part in the great march past.

A week afterwards I left for England, and a fortnight after the review lunched at the mess of an English dragoon regiment. Prizes were being given for the best-set-up men. It was, of course, in the pre-khaki days. Very resplendent did our men look, a brilliant spectacle for all spectators, but coming from Turkey, where I had seen so many thousands of soldiers who had endured the rigours of a Balkan winter in which many men were frozen to death at their posts, as subsequently illustrated in the realistic paintings of Verestchagin, I could not help remarking that the Russian troops were clothed in a more practical fashion for the work they had to do. They had a cap which they could pull down over their ears and would keep them warm, instead of the useless undress saucer of our men. They had strong boots which came up well above their calf, into which they tucked their trousers and which were fastened by a strap and buckle. Instead of looking smart in their scarlet tunics they had a loose and serviceable one. Speaking of this difference after the lunch to two of the officers, one said he agreed with me as to the unserviceable character of the dress and mentioned the fact that in the manœuvres which had taken place two or three months earlier, two-thirds of their men had not taken off their top-boots because it had been raining during the whole week. They believed that if they had taken them off they would never have been able to get them on again.

Early in November, 1878, the British Fleet left Turkish waters. Before quitting the subject of our Fleet's visit to the neighbourhood of Constantinople, I may be allowed to report a conversation which took place many years afterwards and which to most of my readers will suggest thought as to the policy of our Government. Englishmen whose memory goes back to that period probably arrived at the conclusion often still expressed, that it was the dispatch of our Fleet under Admiral Hornby to the Marmara which prevented the Russians from occupying the city. I thought so too, at the time, but many years afterwards Sir William White, when Ambassador in Constantinople, told me a

different story. In the course of a conversation I had remarked that I supposed it was the bringing up of our Fleet and the dispatch of Indian troops to Malta which prevented such occupation. Sir William, who knew more of the secret politics of the Balkan States than any man I ever met, and who was a big, heavy man with so loud a voice that the Turks spoke of him as the Bosphorus bull, roared at me, "Mr. Pears, I gave you credit for much better knowledge. Don't you know the story?" I confessed my ignorance. "Then I will tell you it. Bismarck, the only man who knew of the secret arrangement with Austria, by which Russia was permitted to cross the Balkans (as elsewhere related), in consideration of Austria having the right to administer Bosnia and Herzegovina, learned that Austria was making arrangements for mobilising her army because Russian troops had pushed on to San Stefano. He knew also of the British preparations with regard to our Fleet and the dispatch of Indian troops. He therefore at once telegraphed to the Emperor of Austria advising him to do nothing. 'England will do our business.' Austria did not mobilise, and England obtained the credit or the odium of having saved Turkey from the occupation of its capital, and of having become the one friend of Turkey."

During the Russo-Turkish war Constantinople was by no means a place of unmixed pleasure in which to live. After the Russians had crossed the Danube, crowds of Moslem refugees, including many Circassians, came into Constantinople, bringing with them the plunder which they had taken from Christian villages. They crowded the city and caused an outbreak of typhoid, small-pox, and other diseases. They encamped wherever there was spare ground, drove their cattle and donkeys before them, and offered their booty for sale. Amongst such plunder, priests' robes, ikons, chalices, altar cloths and other things belonging to churches figured largely. Several of us English consulted together to find whether we could purchase the church furniture with the object of restoring it to its rightful owners after the war.

Some few things were thus restored. We decided, however, that as it was usually impossible to learn where the things came from the attempt was useless. I purchased a silver chalice for its weight in that metal. A friend bought a fine donkey for a medjid, worth three shillings and eight pence. A handsomely embroidered altar frontal so purchased decorated my wife's drawing-room for many years.

It was during this time that Colonel Valentine Baker came to Constantinople and took service with the Sultan. He had been Colonel of the 10th Hussars, had seen service in the Crimea, and had a high reputation in the British Army as a cavalry officer and as a strategist. But he had been compelled to leave it under circumstances which, when Her Majesty announced in the Gazette that she had no further need for his services, must have made many a good man say with the old Puritan, on seeing a man go to execution, "There goes John Bradford, but for the grace of God." He was a man of extensive knowledge and of great charm, one whom we all got to like and to respect.

In the course of the war he was placed under Suliman Pasha, who was charged with defending the western portion of the Balkans and the Pass from there to the Rhodope Mountains. When Plevna was captured by the Russians, December 10, 1877, General Gourko, the Russian General who had distinguished himself in the Crimea, pushed on to Sofia, while in January, 1878, occurred the great defeat of the Turks at Shenova, south of the Shipka Pass. While Skobelev had crossed the Balkans to fight that battle, Suliman had withdrawn his army into the Rhodope, and General Gourko began to push on southwards towards Philippopolis. Baker was of opinion that it would have been an easy matter to prevent Gourko's advance. His chief, Suliman, however, withdrew into the mountains, went back and then forward again, and behaved in such a manner that, after Baker returned to Constantinople upon the complete defeat of the Turks, nothing could persuade him that Suliman had not acted treacherously.

Baker had then become my neighbour at Prinkipo, and we discussed the foolish movements of Suliman on various occasions. I suggested that it was a case of imbecility, not of treason, but he persisted in his conclusion. Shortly afterwards Baker returned to England, was fêted by the officers of his old regiment and by many distinguished soldiers, and then came back to Turkey. On his return I asked him one day whether he still maintained that Suliman was a traitor. His answer was, "I think you were right. It was a case of imbecility." I shall have more to say of Baker Pasha when I deal with my next period.

General Skobeleff and I had many conversations in reference to Russia and England. He was proud of his British descent, his great-grandfather having been a Scotsman who had taken service in Russia. He spoke English like an Englishman, and claimed that he had read all the six volumes of Wellington's dispatches and believed him to have been the greatest strategist of modern times, a man whom England, as he thought, curiously underrated. In the course of one of my conversations, he remarked that every Russian was born with the belief that it was the destiny of his country to take possession of Constantinople. Their Emperor was the legitimate successor of those who had reigned on the Bosphorus. Russia's protection of the Christians of Turkey, which practically meant the protection of the adherents of the Orthodox Church, was considered as only what was natural among by far the most important branch of such Church. Russians could not consent to see their brethren of the same Church subject to the persecutions and perpetual tyranny of Moslems, and therefore his country would never be content until they were all set free, and that result could only be accomplished by the acquisition of Constantinople.

"And when, in your opinion, is that likely to happen?"

The answer was, "It is impossible that we should attempt to hold Constantinople leaving a strong power like Austria in our rear. Our road to this capital lies through Vienna."

I confess I am a little doubtful whether Skobelev was quite sincere in implying that the Russians were not prepared even at that time to occupy Constantinople ; because there was then an army of 150,000 Russians within twenty miles of the city, mostly between San Stefano, twelve miles distant, and the Euxine ; while opposed to it a Turkish army which had been badly beaten and was utterly demoralised. A line had been drawn outside Constantinople beyond which neither the Russian nor Turkish troops were to advance, but Baker Pasha informed me that the Russians were constantly exercising their men right up to such line, and performing manœuvres which he and other officers in the Turkish service believed to be provocative. He was convinced indeed that Skobelev at least wished to bring about a fight which would have resulted in the occupation of the capital.

If such were Skobelev's desire, it would have been in keeping with his habits and character. In Central Asia he had won his great victories by exceptional daring, so exceptional, indeed, that he had the reputation among his men of bearing a charmed life. He usually dressed in a white uniform and was known among the Turks as the Ak, or White, Pasha. I passed three days with him at Derwent, about twenty miles from Constantinople, with my eldest son. On one of these days there was a special review in honour of a Finnish general who was adored by his troops. I was greatly interested, not merely in the military movements, but with the large number of blue-eyed and fair-haired men amongst them. On returning from the review to our camp the regiment was preceded by a body of stalwart soldiers who looked as if they belonged to a race of giants. During our four-mile march they sang in the lustiest manner, one of them being noted as an improvisator. An *aide-de-camp* by whom we were accompanied translated much of what the man sang. He made jokes at the expense of the officers, at which there was Homeric laughter. He celebrated the deeds of the Finnish general, at which they applauded with equal gusto. They formed a glorious and happy company of fighting veterans.

On one of the evenings we attended evening prayers at which 15,000 men formed a huge square. All joined heartily in the Amens. The distance from the officiating priest was so great that Skobeleff and I were able to converse without being observed. The only portion of his conversation which is worth noting is that in his opinion constitutional government in Russia on English lines was difficult, though he had no doubt that the country would arrive before long at having some sort of representative assembly. The difficulty of forming a second chamber was greatly enhanced by the fact of their having a large number of notables and especially of princes, too numerous to be got rid of, and yet an element that would have to be considered. "In the regiments around us," said he, "there are probably at least from sixty to a hundred Princes." We talked of English politics. The one point which he could not understand was how the Disraeli party could support the Turks in their abominations. When I returned to Constantinople he gave me his portrait, with an inscription upon it, as a memento of the time we had passed together.

As to the question whether the Russians entertained the idea of occupying Constantinople at that time, I heard a curious story which was supported by telegrams published three or four years later in, I think, *La Revue Diplomatique*. It was asserted that the Grand Duke, who was in command of the Russian Army when before Constantinople, sent three telegrams to the Czar. The first two related to military dispositions and have no interest for us; the third substantially said, "Our troops can see the dome of S. Sophia and constantly ask when they are going to be present there at a Christian service. We can occupy the city, and the sacrifice of life at the outside would not be more than 7,000 men. Shall we occupy it?" Within the next two days answers came to the two telegrams regarding military dispositions: no answer was ever received to the third. The Czar had given his promise that Constantinople should not be occupied, and the suggestion was that no answer was sent because the Czar was unwilling to take the responsibility of

breaking his word. Or was he willing to allow the Grand Duke to act on his own responsibility and then if the Powers objected to disown the Grand Duke's act? Who knows?

There are certain personal reminiscences concerning the war which I may note. We had a number of distinguished correspondents of English, French, and German papers in the city. Galenga, who represented the *Times*, had been a friend of Mazzini, of Cavour and of Garibaldi. He was a man of stern inflexibility, yet agreeable and essentially kindly. George Augustus Sala was the Special Correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, and delighted everybody by the exuberance of his good humour and the versatility of his talents. He could let out, however, when occasion needed it, being, as is well known, a man of very passionate temper. I was present with three or four of my colleagues when a consul who was rather notorious for giving himself airs described us to a companion as "*les va-nu-pieds de correspondants*." Sala heard it and gave him a trouncing in French which astonished the consul and pleased all of us.

As to Sala's versatility, Galenga told me a good story. When he was with Sala in America, Galenga had remarked to him that he did not believe there was any subject on which he, Sala, could not write an interesting letter. Sala agreed, and said, "Give me a subject." At that time Galenga's old boots were standing by the door, and their owner said, "Write on old boots." Three or four weeks afterwards there came back from England a quite charming letter on "old boots." He was a true *litterateur*.

With Sala was associated, for the *Daily Telegraph*, Sir Campbell Clark, not yet knighted, a man whom we all learned to like, and who put together scraps of information so as to astonish Lord Salisbury at the Berlin Congress into admitting that he had rightly constructed the Cyprus Convention. There was also Melton Prior, correspondent of the *Illustrated London News*. The *Pall Mall Gazette* was represented by M. Barrère, afterwards, and for a long period,

the French Ambassador in Rome. Mr. Carl Schneider represented a leading German newspaper, I think the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, and M. Chevalier the *Temps* of Paris. All these, with two or three others, met on three or four evenings in the week, frankly pooled their news, and thus sent their accounts to Europe, free from the recklessness which characterises so many telegrams of the present day, which leave the experienced correspondent with an impression of want of care as to their veracity.

It was suggested, I think by Mr. Melton Prior, the artist correspondent of the *Illustrated London News*, that the correspondents should be photographed in a group. The fact that I am in the chair requires the following explanation. I protested against being given such a post of honour, but Galenga said, "No, you led this business. We followed." Sala took up the same position, and thus in a certain sense I was forced into it.

Before leaving the question of correspondents, I may mention the following incident. In the autumn of 1876 I went to Alexandria. The steamer by which I returned touched only at the Piræus. Between Athens and that port I made the acquaintance of an Austrian, a soldier and a gentleman. He spoke very little English, and our conversation was in French. At the Piræus we were joined by an Englishman, whom I will call Captain Smith, though that was not his name. He had been master, so he said, of an English merchant vessel, and as such had taken part in the Crimean war. By his own account he presented himself to me and my Austrian friend as an unprincipled man. He boasted of having sold in the Crimea a cargo of cattle to the British commissariat, which he had been paid for, and which he had been ordered to retain on board his vessel until further orders. As there was some delay he went round the point and sold it to the French commissariat and once more received payment. There was again a little delay, and he returned and delivered the cargo to the British. My Austrian friend, who understood English better than he spoke it, made a comment which Captain Smith did not

understand. I replied that there were *vauriens* among all people, and I supposed that our companion was one.

But this was nothing to what he then told us. Substantially it was in the following words. "There is a fellow in Constantinople who has been making the devil of a row about what he calls Moslem atrocities in Bulgaria. Now, I was thrown out of work by the stoppage of a newspaper," and he produced his card, upon which he was called "Representative" of the paper in question, which had recently ceased publication. Thereupon it occurred to him to visit the Turkish Ambassador in London, to call his attention to what this fellow had done, and to propose that the Ambassador should send him with a good salary, furnished with letters of introduction, to the Grand Vizier and other authorities. He would then go out to Turkey and find atrocities on the other side, and he added, with a twinkle of familiarity, that he "could find them."

The Ambassador welcomed the proposition. I expressed my scepticism, and he thereupon produced from his pocket a letter to the Grand Vizier, sealed, of course, and two open letters written in French which shewed that he was to be furnished with horses and carriages and every facility for making a report upon Bulgaria. A portion of the conversation was followed by my Austrian friend, I occasionally helping him out where he did not completely follow it, and when we had got rid of the Captain he expressed his indignation in the strongest terms that he could find in the French language. We arrived in Constantinople early next morning. Later in the day, to my surprise, I saw Captain Smith, accompanied by the correspondent of an illustrated paper whom I greatly respected, come into the club where I was lunching. When he saw me there was a silly look upon his face, shewing that he had been informed who the fellow was whose reports he was to write down. I took him aside, and told him that I should watch carefully the paper for which he said he was going to write. As long

as his reports were fair I should say nothing about them, but if he invented atrocities I should tell my story. He took the remarks in fairly good humour.

Next day the correspondent, whom I knew well, a considerably younger man than myself, came to me and asked my advice. "This Captain Smith," said he, "has now obtained, in French and Turkish, letters by the Grand Vizier to the Vali and all in authority in Bulgaria, ordering them to supply him and his companion with horses and a carriage, and to see that they are well entertained wherever they go; and he suggests that I should go as his companion, he undertaking to pay all my expenses, which, considering my arrangement with my newspaper, is very important for me." My reply was that I was convinced he was a bad lot, but recognised that the temptation to have all his expenses paid was a very strong one. He went. A month afterwards he returned, and called on me. "Where's your friend?" I asked. "Oh, I stood him for three weeks, but nothing would have induced me to stay longer with him. He is a much bigger scoundrel than even you took him to be." Such are the things that happened in Turkey in the 'seventies.

I may here relate an incident arising out of the Turko-Russian war which may amuse my fellow members of the bar. I was retained on behalf of two ships and their cargoes, which had been seized in the Bosphorus for attempting to run the blockade proclaimed by the Turks against Russia. The real question was not one of fact, but the purely technical one of continuing voyage. Their cargoes had been shipped in Russia, and the Turks claimed that they were not free from arrest until they were in the Aegean. I maintained the contrary. Two embassies were concerned, inasmuch as the cargoes belonged to the subjects of one nation and the ships to another.

With the object of having at least a chance of justice, I called upon both the Ambassadors, who each agreed that if I made application to the ordinary Turkish courts a decision

would be given by which my clients would lose both ships and cargoes. I asked therefore for a Prize Court which should have some members on it who would not be ready to obey the mere orders of the executive. Both Ambassadors gave me the strongest assurances that they would make representations to such effect. The matter was pressing, as both ships were under demurrage. The Ambassador for Patagonia, as I will call him, was the strongest in his assurances that such a Court should be instituted. Three weeks passed and I went to see the Patagonian. He assured me that he was doing all that he possibly could, and in spite of my pointing out that in any case we should have to suffer heavily for demurrage, he replied that I must have patience. On my way from his residence I called upon Count Corti, the Italian Ambassador. I informed him of my visit to his colleague, when, in his lively Italian fashion, he jumped out of his chair and said, "Will you repeat what you said?" I repeated it and informed him that I would give it to him in writing if he liked. "No," he replied, "your word's enough. But what you tell me explains the difficulties that I have met with. Let me hear you state your case, and I'll oppose your arguments."

Count Corti had been Chairman of the Commission at Washington which had decided upon the claims of England in similar cases brought forward contemporaneously with America's claims upon England arising out of the *Alabama*. I stated my case. He opposed, raked me with questions and even went so far as to say, "I am putting these questions not because I am opposing you really, but I want to know what can be said on the other side." We spent a good hour together, then he jumped out of his seat and said, "You've beaten me, and now I am more than a match for the Patagonian." He asked me to give him four and twenty hours and to return the next evening.

When I went he informed me that he had had a long argument with the legal representative of the Sultan, and had shewn them that our view was right. "But," said he, "the Sultan wants if he possibly can to preserve the prin-

ciple. It seems to me that such a state of circumstances is not likely to occur again, and I have arranged a programme by which you shall get your ships and cargoes if you will fall in with it. Are you ready to take part in a farce?" I replied that I was ready for farce or comedy, but not for tragedy. "Then," said he, "you shall have your ships and cargo and I shall beat the Patagonian. You will be summoned to-morrow for a meeting on the following day of a specially constituted Prize Court of eleven members. My dragoman will be there, but you must not see him, still less speak to him. The advocate for the Government will ask that you shall be condemned. You will reply. You will be condemned, and the next day, by special grace of the Sultan, you will be pardoned. In that way His Majesty thinks that he will save the principle. The only person in the court who will know of the little farce which I have arranged, besides yourself, will be the President. Play your part with confidence, and leave the rest to me."

I was cited as arranged, and to my surprise, when I entered the Court, instead of taking the usual place assigned to defendant's counsel, I was invited by the President, a fine old Turk whom I knew slightly, to take a chair next to him on his left. He whispered to me, "The farce will begin if you are ready." I nodded assent, and the Crown Advocate asked for my condemnation, and took half an hour to develop his case. Then I was called upon, and, being very full of my subject, proceeded to demolish my opponent's argument entirely to my own satisfaction. Indeed, I spoke so confidently that the President pulled me slightly and whispered, "*Ne pressez pas la chose trop loin*," and at the end of about half an hour I sat down. My opponent got up to reply, when the President said, to the surprise of everybody, "We don't want to hear any more arguments," and requested us to retire while the Court deliberated. This we did, and after about three-quarters of an hour, much to my surprise at the length of the delay when the conclusion was foregone, we were called in and my clients were

condemned. The President whispered to me, "The second act is finished; the third will commence and finish to-morrow." As had been arranged, ships and cargo were released.

CHAPTER IV

EAST AND WEST

The Anti-Russian British Colony—An Address to Sir Henry Elliot—I Protest—Journalism Extraordinary—Mr. Layard Becomes Ambassador—The Marquess of Bath—"A Year Behind the Fair"—Mr. W. E. Forster—A Grand Vizier's Rudeness—Mr. Hughes's Revenge—"The Only Gentleman in Europe"—British Tommies and a Turkish Toll Collector—Gallantry and Death—A Strange Court Scene—The Scots at Hasskewi—How a Lawyer Cannot be a Jackass.

THE British colony in Constantinople continued to be anti-Russian, though with decreasing violence. I had many struggles with its leading members, who wished to issue declarations for the English papers on behalf of the colony in favour of the Turks. Many of these struggles possessed only a temporary interest, but one is worth noticing. The pressure upon the Government by English public opinion to remove Sir Henry Elliot became too strong to be resisted. It was notorious that he and Lord Salisbury had differed widely in opinion, and it was still the impression that he had defended the Turkish outrages, though he had known the truth regarding them. Hence, early in 1878, he was removed from Constantinople to Vienna. Thereupon a meeting of the colony was called to prepare an address to him. On such an occasion it was right and proper that every kindly thing consistent with truth should be said of him. An address had been prepared by a prominent member of the community, which had given unqualified approval of his policy and spoke in very high terms of his private character.

At the meeting I strongly objected to any approval of his policy, and my objection aroused great opposition. Among the men present was Mr. Morgan Foster, President of the Ottoman Bank, also a newspaper proprietor who was in receipt of a subsidy from the Turkish Government, and many men who were or had been and hoped again to be in contractual relations with the Government. They angrily defended the clause, and three or four of them declared that I stood alone in objecting to it. I did stand alone at the meeting. But at that time we had a very remarkable and interesting colony of British (mostly Scots) engineers at Hasskewi, on the Golden Horn, who had recently come from England, and whose instincts were still British. I had met some of the members and found that they were not under the influence of Crimean traditions, and probably few of them ever saw a newspaper costing more than a penny. When, therefore, I was told that I stood alone in disapproving the policy which Sir Henry pursued, I replied without hesitation that if they carried the resolution approving of his political conduct, I would get up a counter demonstration and undertake to obtain at least as many and probably more signatures against it. I was angrily told that I could not do so, but the Chairman, who knew something of the colony, pointed out that it was most desirable that the meeting should be unanimous, and at his request the members consented to the omission of the phrase objected to.

I saw Mr. Galenga on the evening after this meeting had taken place. Great, therefore, was his surprise and mine when we saw the address printed in the subsidised English paper containing the passage which it had been agreed to omit. I immediately wrote to the editor, shewing the letter to Galenga, and sent it by a messenger who was to wait for the answer. He brought an answer within a half-hour, and the editor informed us that it had been inserted by mistake! We were both incredulous, and Mr. Galenga in the columns of the *Times* explained what had been done.

I have said that this feeling in favour of the Turks and of hostility towards Russia existed most strongly during the

early part of the war. At that time I believed that I stood alone in the British colony, for though amongst the engineers at Hasskewi I found there was a strong sentiment in favour of my views, I was unaware of the fact. Some amongst the Americans were with me from the first. The position may be gathered from a remark made by the Marquess of Bath. Shortly after the arrival of Mr. Layard, who was transferred from Madrid to Constantinople on March 31, 1877, in succession to Sir Henry Elliot, Lord Bath called on me. He was an excellent specimen of a most useful class in the Lords. He belonged to the Tory Party, but had a singular aloofness of character which made his judgment upon political events and public characters illuminating to one like myself who had fewer opportunities of hearing both sides. He took notes of every conversation he had with me. Even in the streets he would pull out his note-book and make a short entry. In the Eastern question he was a strong supporter of Gladstone. He passed some days at Prinkipo.

On one occasion, after dining at our house, when the three or four other guests who had been present went in to the *sala*, we remained alone. The last to leave was a friend, fluent in speech and usually of good judgment, but who had been pouring out a string of complaints against the Turks, whom he knew well, declaring that they were hopeless. Lord Bath remarked, "I expected to find you, 'the voice of one crying in the wilderness,' but I find that everyone whom I meet agrees with your view of the Turks." My answer was, "You are a year behind the fair. The very man who has just left was incapable six months ago of saying anything in favour of the Russians or against the Turks." *Tempora mutantur.*

Mr. Forster in the House of Commons, and the Duke of Argyll in the Lords, had taken great interest in the facts I brought to light regarding the Moslem atrocities in Bulgaria. I mention them in particular, not only from their conspicuous position, but from the fact that both were men of cool judgment and of great human sympathy. The Duke was in the fulness of his mental power, and his opinions,

expressed both in the House of Lords and elsewhere, carried great weight with the thoughtful portion of the community. Mr. Forster determined that he would come out and see for himself. This he did, accompanied by his son. He went to Bucarest and Sofia and then came on to Constantinople. After he had been a few days in the city he came down to my house at Prinkipo to take a rest. As near as I can fix the date, this would be in September, 1876.

Mr. Forster was accompanied on his visit to Prinkipo by Mr. Hughes, who had been Secretary at the Embassy twenty years earlier. At that time he had as his colleagues one or two who were distinguished rather by their eccentricity than by their application. The late Mr. Labouchere had some curious stories to tell of them. One related of Mr. Hughes, which was told many years since in an English magazine as referring to one of his colleagues, Mr. Alison, is worth telling. Both these men, unlike the majority of Secretaries, had made themselves first-class Turkish and Arabic scholars. The great elchee, or ambassador, Stratford Canning, subsequently Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, was Ambassador, a man of whom the tradition is that he was exacting in his work from the Secretaries, but would defend them through thick and thin if they were right.

At that time there was a Grand Vizier who prided himself upon being rude to Secretaries of Embassy. Hughes, who spoke Arabic well, had to see him upon a matter of business and went to his room at the Sublime Porte. He was ostentatiously kept waiting several minutes by the Vizier and then was allowed to explain his business. In the course of it the Vizier rose and said that it was time for him to say his prayers, and accordingly went through them in the same room. At the end he said a prayer aloud which is only occasionally used, consigning all Giaours to a very warm place, looking meantime towards Hughes. Then he returned to his chair and Hughes continued his explanations for some minutes, at the end of which he remarked, "It is time for me to say my prayers." He accordingly knelt down, said certain prayers in Arabic, concluding with one made up for

the occasion. He prayed that Allah would make a fire seven times hotter than he had ever before dreamt of, and would consign to it all Grand Viziers and other persons who insulted Christians. The Grand Vizier was furious. The interview ended abruptly, and, as no doubt Hughes anticipated, the Minister complained to Lord Stratford. The Ambassador looked into the matter and replied that he, the Grand Vizier, had commenced by insulting his Secretary, and that the Secretary had very naturally resented the insult. I never heard that anything further came of the matter.

The incident is interesting as marking the end of a period during which the Turks considered it their privilege to insult foreigners with impunity. It is true that I am speaking of a period when some foolish person started the theory that the Turk was the only gentleman left in Europe. There is an aspect in which this view of the Turk is justified. Probably the slaveholders of the Southern States amongst themselves were typical gentlemen. The amenities of civilisation were carefully observed between them, but these did not apply to the nigger. Now though the Turks never treated foreigners with the same indignity that they treated their Christian fellow subjects, although they, like those subjects, were Giaours, there was always a tendency amongst them to forget that though a man was a Christian he was not a rayah, and it took upwards of a generation, even in Constantinople, to get rid of the sentiment in the Turkish mind that a Christian might be insulted with impunity.

¶ The late Mr. Stavrides, one of the able dragomans attached to our Embassy, had many stories to tell illustrative of the Turkish attitude of mind towards foreigners. It was awkward when, during the Crimean war, our soldiers came into contact with lower-class Turks who had been placed in authority. For example, Stavrides told of two life-guardsmen who were passing over the crowded bridge connecting Galata with Stambul. They observed one of their officers at some distance before them. It was probably the first time that he had been over the bridge when not in uniform,

and did not know the rule, still prevailing, that soldiers in uniform pass over without paying, but that everyone else has to pay. The collector stopped him and as he apparently did not know why he was stopped, he attempted to pass. The collector seized him roughly as he would have done any native Christian. The two men of his troop came up, saluted and requested him to pass on. They would attend to the collector. The officer was quite ready to accept their advice. When he had got some distance away they took the collector by the hands and the legs and simply chucked him over into the Golden Horn.

Let me give another story of Stavrides to the same effect. The palace women, always beautifully dressed and wearing the thinnest of muslin yashmaks, often drove across the same bridge, two of them in a carriage together, followed by a eunuch on horseback. As a French officer was walking over it, two of these ladies kissed their hands to him. Was there ever a French officer who would have been rude enough not to return the salute? The eunuch saw it, rushed at him and struck him a heavy blow across the head with his whip. The officer drew his sword, ran the man through, then withdrew it and coolly wiped it on the man's clothes and went his way.

There was a great fuss at the palace, not so much because a eunuch had been killed but of the indignity offered to a palace servant. Formal complaint was made to General Canrobert, who at that time was with a portion of the French Army in Scutari. Canrobert replied to the Sultan that he had made enquiries and learnt that his officer had been struck by a black creature and that in consequence the officer had killed him, adding that if he had not done so he would publicly have torn the epaulettes from his shoulders in the presence of his regiment. It was a rough lesson, but it needed to be given.

Another on somewhat the same lines illustrates the same attitude of mind. I knew the Englishman of whom the story was told and, having heard it from others, I persuaded him one day to give his own version. He sued a man in the

most important Turkish court for trying "mixed cases," that is, between Europeans and Turkish subjects. When the Turk came to tell his tale he spoke of the Englishman as a Giaour or infidel. The Englishman complained. Though the judges knew perfectly well that it is contrary to Turkish law to use such an epithet, they did not interfere, whereupon the Englishman said, "If you call me a Giaour again I shall take the law into my own hands." The Turk at once replied, "Well, you are a Giaour." Thereupon the Englishman stepped across the floor three or four paces and gave him one on the nose which startled him and the court. As the blood flowed freely there was a great hubbub and orders were given to arrest the Englishman. He was a fine, powerful fellow and instantly smashed the stool (*scamnum* or *scamn * in common parlance) on which he was seated, and cried out that he would brain the first man who laid hands upon him.

The English dragoman who first told me the story said that thereupon everybody hesitated to attack the Englishman, and he, the dragoman, Alischan, was asked by the President to step down and request the aggressor to apologise and there would be an end of the matter. "Apologise!" said the Englishman, "not a bit of it. He insulted me and I let him have it." Poor Alischan went back to the President and said, "This is a kind of Englishman who won't stand an insult, and I can do nothing with him." Thereupon the court ordered the proceedings to go on as if nothing had happened.

In the year 1875 I lectured to the Scots at Hasskewi, and we became great friends. They were a fine body of men, sober, honest, and self-reliant. They ran their own school, their own Literary Institute, kept their own minister of religion, Presbyterian, of course, and successfully established a Co-operative Association in order to keep themselves out of the hands of the small local merchants. It must have been at the end of '75 that I attended perhaps the largest meeting of purely British subjects that I have ever seen in Turkey. This was organised by the engineers in their

Hasskewi Institute. There were upwards of four hundred persons present, consisting mostly of about two hundred engineers with their wives and relations. On the platform were nine ministers of religion, four or five belonging to our Established Church and the others Presbyterians.

The Chairman was Sir Philip Francis, who was then Consul-General and Judge. Several of these ministers spoke. It pleased these reverend gentlemen, taking their cue from the first who spoke, to attack the lawyers, all, of course, good-humouredly. Whereupon Sir Philip passed a paper to me : "Go for these parsons." Nothing that I said is worth recording except that I told a story which fetched the audience and turned the tables wonderfully on the ministers. I said that our profession at least required us to be intelligent men ; that, as they knew, English law depended largely upon precedent, and that there was an ancient legal case I had seen which settled the question of the necessity of intelligence and knowledge between the clergy and the lawyers. I had read it partly in old English, partly in Norman French, and partly in Latin, and it was to this effect. A priest brought an action for *esclaunderie*, alleging that the defendant had called him "une grande jackasse" (really what I had read was "un ydamned foole"). Thereupon the lawyer of the defendant declared that such words would not give rise to an action. Upon that the court deliberated and gave its decision in favour of the defendant "parceque un homme peut estre bon prête et grande jackasse," but otherwise of a lawyer (*sed aliter d'un attorney*). The audience caught the point and roared with laughter, in which my friends the clergy joined.

Going back to Galata that moonlight evening along the Golden Horn, Sir Philip Francis asked me where I had got my story. I replied that, as he knew, I had been engaged in editing the *Law Magazine* during the last part of the time I was in England, and wanting an article I looked up old magazines of twenty years earlier and found it there. "Then," said he, "it is very curious how things rise up in judgment against a man. That story is not to be found in

the law books at all. At that time I was editing the *Law Magazine*, and had a friend who was always abusing the clergy, and with that I remarked that it was quite possible a man should not be learned and yet be good at his own work. He admitted that that was so, and said he thought he could make a good story out of it ; made the story in question and then put it into old English, Norman French, and Latin." Sir Francis died suddenly on board the British dispatch boat in the autumn of 1876.

with the *Confederate*
 - 12. 1876. *Confederate* - *Confederate*
 - 12. 1876. *Confederate* - *Confederate*

CHAPTER V

THE REVOLUTION OF 1876

Turkey's Finances—Heavy Losses—The Moral Effect—Outcry Against the Sultan's Extravagance—His Passion for Building—Abdul Aziz a Prisoner—His Suicide—A Committee of Examination—The Trial of Ministers—The Tradition of the Turkish Palace—Murad Ascends the Throne—He is Deposed and Succeeded by Abdul Hamid—The Question of a Constitution—A Revelation of Abuses—The New Form of Government—A Blunt Speaker—The Traditional Method—A Question of Right or Wrong.

THE revolution that had occurred in Turkey was almost contemporaneous with the more serious events in Bulgaria which led to the Russo-Turkish war. The reigning Sultan was Abdul Aziz. There was general dissatisfaction in the country due to the heavy amount of taxation, which touched all classes, and to the personal extravagance of the Sultan and his harem. The wealthier inhabitants of Constantinople had been influenced by the practical repudiation of the National Debt which occurred in the autumn of 1875. The financial blow was great, because many Turks had invested all their savings in Ottoman securities, following in this respect the example of English and French subjects. It was reported at the time that Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, one of the ablest Ambassadors that any country ever sent to Turkey, who was then living in retirement in England, had invested the whole of his savings in such securities.

In consequence of the repudiation a large number of English and French bondholders also lost very heavily. The

loss fell unfortunately, in hundreds of cases, upon comparatively poor persons, the widows of clergymen and other professional men, to whom the difference between getting three per cent. and four or four and a half was of vital importance. The securities went down to next to nothing. It is true that by a subsequent law, called the Decree of Moharem, the Turkish Government was able to conciliate the financial classes of Europe and to restore very largely its financial credit by setting aside the revenues arising from six articles to be devoted solely to the payment of bondholders, and by establishing a department of the Government composed of representatives of foreign states, whose subjects had invested money in Turkish funds—a department which, because it was managed by foreigners, has been the only successful one in Turkey since it was established. But this was of little advantage to the small investors, who, with the object of saving something out of the wreck of their fortunes, had unfortunately sold their securities.

The moral effect was not less grave. Public confidence was lost, and the Turk, who had been upheld in England and France as the soul of honesty and truthfulness, became discredited. It was natural that it should be so when stories like the following came out. Mr. Morgan Foster, the Director-General of the Ottoman Bank, a man whose reputation was beyond cavil, hearing rumours that the Turks were about to repudiate, called upon the Grand Vizier to learn the truth. He was assured upon the Minister's honour that the Government had no idea of doing anything of the kind. The very next day the Decree of Repudiation was issued, and Mr. Foster declared that he had trustworthy information that it had already been signed by the Grand Vizier himself before he visited that functionary.

As has not uncommonly happened in Turkey, public disaffection turned against the Sovereign. The charge brought against him by public opinion was that of gross extravagance, which shewed itself in the construction of palaces on the Bosphorus and in the neighbourhood of Constantinople.

The persons most active in the outcry against the Sultan were the Ulema, a class which includes all Moslems engaged in teaching. They put forward the students, or softas, and these men made daily demonstrations in Stambul. All things being ready, the Ministers struck their blow. A portion of the Turkish fleet lay off the beautiful palace of Dolmabagshe on the Bosphorus, about two miles north of Seraglio Point. The palace was surrounded and Abdul Aziz was made prisoner. No opposition was made either by troops or the fleet. The Sultan was taken by boat from his palace to a beautiful little kiosk at Seraglio Point. After remaining there a few days he was conveyed back to the palace, where, on June 4, he committed suicide by opening the veins in his left arm with a pair of long, thin, and pointed scissors used commonly in Turkey. The Ministers were very anxious to shew that the case was one of suicide and not of assassination, and accordingly requested each foreign Embassy to send its medical man in order to make an examination of the body. Nineteen men took part in the examination and signed a report stating that Abdul Aziz had died by his own hand.

The story told by his mother was pathetic. She had been allowed freely to see her son, and at his request lent him a pair of scissors with which to trim his beard. She was able to see into the room where her son was sitting without entering, and the first alarm as to his death was given by her. She saw him seated in an arm-chair with his head leaning heavily on one side. When she and others hastened into the room they found him recently dead with great spurts of blood from his left arm, and with a smaller number of such spurts from the right, upon the floor. The poor woman seems never to have doubted that he had perished by his own hand ; neither did the nineteen commissioners.

The English representative, Dr. Dickson, lived to be upwards of ninety years of age and kept a keen intelligence until his death, twenty years after that of Abdul Aziz. He told me shortly after the post mortem examination which he made, that he was prevented getting to the palace in

time to see the body with the other commissioners, but he went there firmly convinced that the Sultan had been killed. So firmly convinced was he of the truth of his suspicion, that after having examined the body for marks of violence he carefully examined it for signs of poison. He went away with the conviction that the case was one of suicide and not murder. At a somewhat later date he wrote a full account of his examination to the *Lancet*.

I may as well get rid of this subject by mentioning that in 1881, when Abdul Hamid had ascended the throne, the surviving members of the Ministry, including Midhat Pasha, were charged with the murder of Abdul Aziz. A carefully prepared case was brought before the Turkish court and all persons charged were found guilty, Midhat and others being sentenced to death. Nevertheless, I maintain that Abdul Aziz died by his own hand. I am aware how ingeniously and unscrupulously and how easily in Turkey witnesses can be suborned to present a case to a Turkish court which will be made very plausible, and believe that this case was so presented. By the efforts of the Ambassadors, the death sentence on Midhat was commuted into banishment. He was sent to Arabia and murdered there, in all probability by orders of Abdul Hamid.

Upon the death of Abdul Aziz, his successor Murad ascended the throne. But he was a poor creature who had never been permitted to take any part in Government, and had been encouraged in the licentiousness of a Turkish palace. He was a heavy drinker and the change in his fortunes from being virtually a prisoner to being the occupant of the throne turned his head, and on August 31, 1876, he was formally deposed, and in his stead Abdul Hamid, his brother and the oldest surviving member of the imperial family, ascended the throne.

Following the usual practice with regard to heirs to the throne, Abdul Hamid had been kept strictly under surveillance during the time of Abdul Medjid. When for the first time on record Abdul Medjid, a reigning Sultan, visited

England in 1864, he took with him his two sons, Murad, the Sultan whom we have seen deposed for incompetence, and Prince Abdul Hamid. Highly placed Turks told many stories of the lack of courage in England on the part of Abdul Hamid, but the only one worth mentioning here is of his strong determination to remain in England, and of his attempt to be accidentally left behind. If, as is suggested, this was from fear of being made away with, it would hardly be fair to attribute his conduct to cowardice. The traditions of the Turkish palace during the last three centuries are full of stories of intrigues, mostly by mothers in the harem, to get rid of nearer claimants to the throne in favour of their own sons. Following this same practice, though the mention of it is chronologically out of place, it may be noted that Abdul Hamid himself kept his two brothers, the deposed Murad and Reshad Effendi, who was the heir to his throne, and, as I write, is now reigning Sultan under the style of Mahomet V., for thirty years in close imprisonment. When in 1909 Abdul Hamid was deposed, he whined for mercy to Essad Pasha and Carasso, the delegates chosen by the Turkish Chamber and Senate to inform him of the national decision, and laid great emphasis on the fact that he had not killed his brother.

Abdul Hamid ascended the throne August 31, 1876. During the next nine months he was feeling his way to actual power. A project of Constitution which was drawn up mainly by Midhat Pasha was submitted for his approval, and whether he liked it or not he had to consent to its promulgation. Probably that which influenced him to give it sanction was the serious political difficulty in which he found himself. His mind was always tricky. There had assembled, December, 1876, in Constantinople, the Conference of the Representatives of the Powers, already mentioned, and the Sultan well knew that a project of reforms was to be submitted which would lessen the Imperial Prerogative and diminish his reputation in the eyes of his subjects. The problem before him was how to defeat the plans of the European Delegates. Rumours of what he

proposed to do were widespread at the time. Midhat, who was then Grand Vizier, probably saw a chance of obtaining the grant of a Constitution by playing up to the Sultan's desire to checkmate the Powers. Accordingly a theatrical *coup* was played.

The Conference met in the Admiralty Buildings on the Golden Horn. A few days after they had disclosed their plans, their sittings were interrupted by the booming of a hundred guns, fired from the Turkish ships in the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus. Thereupon Sir Henry Elliot, the British Ambassador, proposed to the Delegates that they should discontinue their sittings because those guns meant that the Sultan had issued a Constitution, which granted more privileges to the whole of the Empire than those which they had proposed to grant only to Serbia, Bulgaria, and Montenegro, the disaffected provinces. Thereupon, after a little hesitation, General Ignatiev expressed his opinion that he and his colleagues were there, charged with a specific mission by their respective Governments, and had nothing to do with any proclamation of the Sultan. Lord Salisbury supported the same view, and the sittings of the Conference continued.

The most important article in Midhat's Constitution provided for a Chamber of Representatives from all parts of the empire. It was an honest, bold, and praiseworthy attempt to substitute a constitutional form of Government for absolutism. Its proclamation failed in its endeavour to put an end to the Conference, but it was welcomed by the more thoughtful of the subjects of the Sultan of all races. The Chamber met, and its deliberations filled friends of Turkey with hope that the new form of government would put an end to the great abuses in Turkey and give her a new chance of life. Many of the deputies were really able men desirous and hopeful of national progress. Of course there were no traditions of parliamentary government, and many of the speeches made provoked merriment, but the general tone was serious and businesslike. They attacked abuses and the Pashas who were or ought to have been responsible

for them. Their earnestness and the keen sense of what the country needed were very striking.

The existence of abuse was largely a revelation to the deputies themselves. The member for Jerusalem or for Salonica, or other distant places, spoke as if he believed that the district from whence he came was exceptional in the rankness of corruption. The discussions shewed us outsiders, as well as the members themselves, that the Government from one end of the country to the other required the most radical reforms. The members became so serious that the Pashas became alarmed, and I remember writing to the *Daily News* that the Chamber would shortly get rid of the offending Pashas or the Pashas of the Chamber. Its President was a certain Ahmed Vefyk, who was a neighbour of mine, and whom I knew well. He had been Ambassador in France, a favourite of Napoleon III., and considered himself, as he was, very much superior in education and intelligence to the mass of the deputies. But as Speaker he was amusingly despotic. From the presidential chair he constantly stopped members, telling them that they knew nothing at all of what they were talking about. Dr. Washburn was present when a Saracli, a white-turbaned Mollah who was prosing along in somewhat dismal fashion, was suddenly brought up by a stentorian shout from the Speaker of, "Shut up, you donkey!" (*Sus eshek!*)

Nevertheless, in spite of many shortcomings and of ignorance of parliamentary usage, the attempt at legislation was an honest one. It was brought abruptly to an end by Abdul Hamid, who gave us, perhaps for the first time, a sample of how he wished to govern. A debate had taken place one day, in which certain charges were made against two Ministers whom the Chamber asked to be brought before it to give explanations. Next morning we learnt that all the deputies had been packed off during the night to the places they represented. No more was heard of attempts to govern Turkey constitutionally until 1908.

In taking leave of this part of my subject I must say

something more of the position in which I was placed. I have mentioned that I had the co-operation of Dr. Washburn and Dr. Long, the first a model of clear-sightedness and conscientiousness, and the second a great Bulgarian scholar with an abundance of generous zeal. It was, however, in the interest of Robert College that their names as president and vice-president should not be associated with the sensation aroused in England by my letters on the Moslem outrages in Bulgaria. The British community in Constantinople, still for the most part living under the glamour of the Crimean war, were fervent supporters of Turkey and still more violent opponents of Russia. I believed that for several months I stood alone in the attitude I assumed on the subject of Turkish misrule. I was denounced in the local papers as an enemy of Turkey, but stood my ground. Many friends assured me that the Eastern Christian was worthless and that the Turk was the only man in the country who counted, and that my personal interest lay in cultivating him. Perhaps it did; but if I may venture to say so, the fact that I stuck to my convictions is one of the proudest recollections of my life. But as the weeks rolled on after the publication of my early letters, a few of us became possessed of an enthusiasm for the cause of Bulgaria and of the oppressed Christian races, oppressed because they were Christian, and of an intense hostility towards the savage method of suppressing risings which bound us together in a lifelong friendship.

So far as I personally was concerned it required the experience which I had gained in the spring of 1876 to make me realise that in the nineteenth century any nation claiming to be civilised, as Turkey did, could be guilty of such useless and heartless cruelty. I had not then seen what the calculated sufferings inflicted by German troops were capable of. The Turkish outburst I subsequently learnt was part of the traditional method of the Turks in governing subject races during peace times as well as during war. I knew little at first of Turkish history, but my attention was directed to the subject and I have since learnt that the Turks have

never recognised any other method of governing a subject population except by savage methods of repression. But what we learnt even at that time bound a few of us together in the determination to improve the condition of the Christian races under Turkish rule, and to that resolution I have been faithful.

At the same time there was no one amongst us who hated the Turk as a private man. We all recognised that he had traits of kindliness, simplicity, and generosity which made him lovable. It was only when he was acting as one in authority, and when the damnable spirit of fanaticism took possession of him, that he became a savage beast. Even when such spirit was rampant it was well under control by the Government. The massacres took place in Bulgaria as they did subsequently in Armenia, in Thrace, in Cilicia, and in Aidin, by order. Even after Mr. Schuyler and Mr. Baring had issued their terrible reports confirming the statements which I had made, the great cry among the governing classes was to punish all who had given information to either of those two gentlemen or to me, or who were suspected of having done so.

Ahmed Vefyk Effendi, subsequently Grand Vizier, whom I knew well from having been his neighbour, was sent to Adrianople and to Philippopolis to punish such offenders. He began by hanging many Bulgarians. He seized three or four of the leading men who in all probability had given both the delegates proofs of many outrages. We learnt that they were in prison and made representations to Mr. Maynard, the American Minister, and to Sir Henry Elliot. Both these gentlemen took up the cases of the suspected men and obtained orders that they should not be hanged until further enquiry was made. Mr. Maynard, a typical New Englander in appearance, as upright in character as he was in person, had taken the matter up very warmly. I remember that in conversation, alluding to the idle chatter that was common in reference to the intrigues of Russia and the interests of England, he remarked, "This is a question of right and

In Constantinople the talk amongst all the communities never verged on such a question. The moral plane was the lower one of interest. England and Russia, it was everywhere said, would act in accordance with their interests. All other considerations were mere sentiment. Right or wrong meant interest or no interest. England intended to support the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire. She would allow the Turk to govern in his own way. No question of humanity could ever be listened to by statesmen. In justice to Sir Henry Elliot I felt sure then, as I do now, that he was sound at heart, but as has happened on other occasions the people around him were actuated by less worthy sentiments. Even one of his secretaries was foolish enough to write that he had found out some of the sources of my information. In doing so, he of course received the answer that if he had spent his time in learning whether my statements were true he would have been better employed.

John W. Weyman, and that he is
a member of the

CHAPTER VI

ARCHÆOLOGICAL INTERESTS AND LADY ELLENBOROUGH

Dr. Paspates and Dr. Schliemann—My First Visit to the Patriarchal Church—An Impressive Ceremony—The Greek Tradition—The Site of Troy—Interesting Discoveries—Visits to Nicaea—A Visit to Damascus—I Meet the Sheik's Wife—A Remarkable Woman—A Queen of the Desert—Life in the Harem—An Arab Invasion—The Bedouins' Devotion.

MY first notable visit to the Patriarchal Church in Constantinople was either in 1875 or 1876. It was notable, first, because I was accompanied by the most distinguished archæologist in Constantinople, Dr. Paspates, and then because I made the acquaintance of Dr. Schliemann, the first explorer of Hissarlik, the generally accepted site of Troy. Paspates was a Greek, who as a young man had been sent to Harvard University. The story of his mother was romantic. Like most Greek women, she had a great profusion of dark-coloured hair. At the massacre of Chios she was, I believe, under five and twenty years of age, good-looking and intelligent. Though her relations were killed, she was captured and sold as a slave into a Turkish harem.

When she, with numbers of other girls and women, was captured, she hid her jewels in the folds of her hair, so that her captors were unaware of their existence. She had always heard that the English merchants of Smyrna, the nearest important town to the island of Chios, were honourable and trustworthy, and she wrote to one of them, whom she only knew by name, a Mr. Wood, I believe, telling her story, urging him to buy her, and declaring that she had the

means with which to repay him. Wood received the letter, went cautiously about the operation, and succeeded in obtaining her release. It was delightful to hear her son speak of the gratitude which his mother felt to the generous Englishman. Such generosity was not confined to Wood.

To the eternal honour of the British and French colonies in 1825, when the massacre took place, and on many subsequent occasions down to the Armenian massacres of 1895-98, it should be remembered that they have rarely let an opportunity pass of attempting to redeem slaves and to protect the victims of Turkish tyranny from their oppressors. We have the reputation in Turkey which we have had for centuries, of not only being truth-speaking and honest, but of being the protectors of the desolate and oppressed.

The service was an exceptional one, and is peculiar to the Holy Orthodox Church. It was on Easter eve, and a similar service is held in all orthodox churches in Turkey, in every Balkan state, and in Russia. I witnessed it for the first time on the occasion referred to. I have seen it many times since, twice at Nicaea, elsewhere in Turkey, and also in the Russian church. It is impressive in character and I have often wondered why some of our clergy who are fond of dramatic effect in their churches have not introduced it. There is essential unity in the Easter services in all the orthodox churches, but that in the Russian is more orderly, and for scenic display more effective. The striking feature is at midnight, between Saturday and Sunday. The service begins about eleven. The church is in comparative darkness, but every worshipper has in his hand an unlighted candle. The choir sings a number of doleful hymns suggesting grief at the death of our Lord, the congregation remaining silent. The communion table is hidden from the nave by the iconostasis. As the clock strikes twelve the Holy Gates, through which none but priests and reigning sovereigns may pass, are thrown open, and a priest comes forward declaring in a loud

voice, "Christ is risen." Others reply, "He is risen indeed." A light is passed from the bema, the chancel or space behind the iconostasis, and almost instantly everybody's candle is aflame. The congregation has passed from darkness into light. The priest kisses the most distinguished man present, and the kiss is passed round to the others. The women follow, each one giving the greeting, "Christ is risen," and taking the reply, "In truth He has risen." The whole ceremony was most impressive.

On a subsequent occasion Paspates shewed me over the Patriarchal Church, the Patriarch's residence and its adjuncts, and I could not have had a better guide. As one enters the enclosure from the street a large closed door stands before him. That door has never been opened since the stormy times which followed the massacre of Chios, because in the doorway the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church was brutally hanged. Those who are interested in the details of the story will find it well set out in Dr. Walsh's *Two Years in Constantinople*. The writer was chaplain to the Embassy, and he relates how on Easter Sunday, which in that year fell on the same day as our Easter (as it does about once in four years, the days coinciding in 1915), he had just finished his festal service in the Embassy chapel when he heard the terrible news. The great and rather ugly Church of the Patriarch had been crowded with worshippers, as it always is on Easter morning. The Patriarch in his full robes was concluding, when a band of Turkish soldiers rushed in and, in spite of the resistance of a few among the terrified congregation, dragged him from the throne of Saint John Chrysostom through the church into the outer court and hanged him in all his robes in the doorway leading into the Patriarchate. Afterwards his body was cut down, dragged through the streets by a Moslem and Jewish mob, and thrown into the neighbouring Golden Horn, whence it was subsequently picked up by a Russian ship and carried off to Odessa, where it now lies.

The Greek population of the capital still guard the tradition of the terrible times which their ancestry passed

through. A friend of my wife is proud to recount how she is the granddaughter of one of the hostages who had been chosen by the prosperous, highly-cultured population of Chios to be held in Constantinople for the good behaviour of the people of the island; how he and his companion hostages were all hanged. Of course their descendants glory in having ancestors who were thus hanged. Of course also it is ridiculous and against all evidence and reasonable expectation to suppose that such descendants entertain loyal feeling towards the Turkish Government, and when, therefore, before the Turco-Russian war, our Ambassador (I am quite sure in good faith) declared that he was astonished at the loyalty of the Greek population, it is simply one proof the more of the lamentable ignorance of the real feelings of the people in which our diplomatic system leaves even our Ambassadors to remain.

In writing my first serious contribution to the history of the Greek empire, called *The Fall of Constantinople, being the Story of the Fourth Crusade*, I received valuable suggestions from Paspates, and as I shall probably have no further need to refer to this volume, I may be permitted to mention that it has been for several years past the approved text-book on the subject in the University of Berlin, and the further fact that, in a series of lectures on the Crusades delivered in Rome in the spring of 1914 by a celebrated French historian, one of his auditors reported that when he came to the Fourth Crusade he declared that there was only one book on the subject to which he would refer them. It was written "par un certain Monsieur Edwin Pears," and though he evidently did not belong to the Catholic Church, it was at once complete and singularly impartial.

Dr. Schliemann, my other companion, deserves great credit for his work at Hissarlik. My old friend Mr. Calvert, who has long since joined the majority, was the first to take up the position that the great mound called Hissarlik was the site of ancient Troy. Up to that time another site, known as Burnabashi, situated higher up the little stream of Scamander, now Mendere, had been so regarded. Its ruins

are much more extensive than those of Hissarlik, but hitherto have yielded poor results to diggers. Dr. Schliemann was convinced by the arguments of Mr. Calvert, and having become a great enthusiast in Homer and ancient Greek literature, expended his wealth royally in making excavations. The museums at Constantinople and at Athens shew abundant specimens of the treasures he found there, treasures indeed which are so numerous, especially of gold ornaments, as to lead some to suspect that they had been found and purchased elsewhere. I do not share this suspicion. It is true that in many parts of Asia Minor to this day similar ornaments are found or are made, but the conservatism that exists in reference to manufacture, and especially in the East, is a sufficient answer to the suggestion that because these ancient objects resemble in structure modern ones, they are therefore not authentic.

I regret that I was not able to visit Hissarlik with Schliemann. I have subsequently visited it on two different occasions. The first time I landed at Neochorion, to the north of Besika Bay, and walked across the great valley, even yet largely marsh, of the Mendere. Mr. Calvert met us at Hissarlik and shewed us over the ruins. On my second visit, some years later, I went from Constantinople to Kum Kali at the extreme end of the southern side of the Dardanelles, and there met a party which had come up from Athens under the guidance of Dr. Dörpfeld. We walked from Kum Kali to Hissarlik, Dörpfeld lecturing by the way at various points and within the mound itself during three hours.

In 1880 I paid my first visit to Nicaea. I was accompanied by my old friend Mr. George C. Pearson, then the Director of the Hyder Pasha-Ismidt Railway, by Hamdi Bey, and his cousin Tewfik Bey, a Turkish civil engineer. As brigands were known to be out in the neighbourhood one of our party got into touch with the chief and arranged to pay him a small sum to prevent our being attacked and held to ransom. The Circassian chief was quite ready to make terms, and at a

reasonable rate, which took the form of payment for an armed Circassian guard. At that time the railway did not extend beyond Ismidt, which is forty miles from Constantinople. We therefore arranged to have horses sent to a village called Yumur Talik, on the south side of the Gulf of Ismidt, crossed the gulf in a caique and spent the night in a Turkish house.

Next day we crossed over the ridge of hills between the Gulf of Ismidt and Lake Ascanius, and after a twelve hours' ride on horseback, always accompanied by our Circassian guard with his rifle, arrived at Nicaea. There was no hotel, but the Greek priest gave us accommodation. We arrived on the eve of the Greek Easter, and I sat up to see the ceremony, which commences about eleven o'clock. I have already described it as I have seen it both in the Patriarchal and in the Russian Church. According to the Patriarchal "use," the reading of the Gospel takes place in the open air, from a platform erected for the purpose. As soon as the announcement that "Christ is risen" is made, there is a large discharge of firearms, and everybody lights his candle. I mention this especially because I remarked at once the terribly fever-stricken aspect of the whole of the congregation. I saw everyone present from my bedroom window, which overlooked the platform round which the congregation was gathered.

We found next day, amongst the small population inhabiting not more than one hundred and twenty huts, an old Italian from Sicily, whom we concluded to be a refugee from vendetta. He claimed to be and practised as a doctor of medicine, and expressed his belief that there were not ten persons among the population who were not suffering badly from malarial fever.

Two incidents occurred which left an impression on my mind. On the evening of our arrival our servants, both of them Moslems, laid the dinner table. We had taken with us table-cloths, knives and forks, crockery, and everything we wanted except water and vegetable food. On the table was a bottle of cognac and a small supply of light French wines.

Hamdi Bey was known as the son of Edhem Pasha, who had recently been Grand Vizier. Accordingly, after the custom of the country, the notables of the place dropped in to pay their respects to the new-comers. One man who, dressed in another costume, would have passed for a country rector, was the village mollah.

My friend Pearson, who took charge of our small commissariat, asked Hamdi in French, which none of the visitors understood, whether he should offer wine or cognac or anything else to this visitor. Hamdi replied, "I can't do it, but you *must*." Whereupon Pearson simply pointed to one bottle and said in the little Turkish he knew, "This is wine," to the other, "This is cognac," and with the usual *burun effendi* invited him to partake of something. The man inspected the two carefully, then took rather more than two-thirds of a tumbler of cognac and, without adding any water, drank the whole lot off without a squirm. We remarked to each other, with the consciousness that we should not be understood, that there was not one amongst us who could have done anything of the kind. I do not believe that the Turks of any class are heavy drinkers, though I have often heard of their being able to take a great quantity of alcohol without its having apparently any ill effect.

Those in the country who do not care for the light native wines which as a rule are not appetising, usually take to drinking what is called mastic, and so far as my experience goes the consumption of this liquor is pretty general. It is an ether rather than an alcohol, but the ether contains gum mastic in solution. When it is poured out it is as clear as water. When water is added it becomes milky.

The other incident occurred on Easter morning. We four travellers were at breakfast and waited on by the priest's wife or daughter. I was downstairs first and seated at the table when she entered the room. I gave her the Easter salutation. She returned it in astonishment and glee, and asked, "Are you a Christian?" Seeing me travelling with two Turks and Turkish servants she had concluded that I was Moslem. Her delight on learning that

we had a common creed was great, and she immediately rushed off and fetched four Easter cakes. I thanked her very sincerely and said that I would keep them until I went out. My friends came in, we had our coffee and went for a ride round the ancient city, and I am bound to admit that I deposited the cakes in a place where the dogs would make short work of them. They were not inviting. Above all things, they did not look clean.

The Sicilian doctor was an interesting old fellow. He knew the names of every European who had visited the city for a quarter of a century before, and had obtained from each of them either their signature or their visiting card. Amongst them I was glad to recognise that of Arthur P. Stanley, who had accompanied the then Prince of Wales on his Eastern travels. The walls and ancient gates of Nicaea are still in fairly good preservation. The gates are picturesque objects. The most important ruin within the walls is the theatre. We have an interesting account of its being built given by Pliny the Younger. His notices of the early Christians in Nicaea and its neighbourhood, all within his jurisdiction, are especially interesting. As to the theatre, he seems to have thought that he would have to pay a large proportion of its cost out of his own pocket. As Nicaea is on a plain, the architect had to provide for obtaining a slope for the auditorium. In Athens, in Ephesus, at Hierapolis, at Laodacia and in other places, the builders of theatres took advantage of the slope of the ground in order to provide for spectators. In Nicaea they built a series of, I think seven, arches radiating from the stage and gradually increasing in height as they receded from it. Upon the raised surface so obtained the necessary number of seats was placed. The material is limestone, put together without mortar and beautifully fitted. No remains of the great Council Chamber which existed in the time of Constantine are now to be seen. It is known to have been upon the shore of the lake, but a portion of the walls have been undermined or have fallen into the lake, and there is very little to indicate where the famous council sat

There are the ruins of what has been a beautiful church dedicated to the Divine Wisdom, Hagia Sophia. In this church it is probable enough that the Second Council of Nicaea, held in 797, met. It had been called by the Empress Irene. Its first meetings were in Constantinople, but the citizens were mostly Iconoclasts, while Irene was fanatically Hellenistic and Iconodoul—a fit representative of the race which had changed its gods into saints and wished to do honour to them, whether represented in sculpture or in painting. The only church which is now used by the Greek inhabitants of the city is probably not earlier than the thirteenth century. To me the great object of interest in it is a picture which is mentioned by Dean Stanley. It represents the meeting of the First Council in 325, shews Arius, Athanasius, and many of the leading Bishops with so considerable an amount of detail that the Dean suggested, remembering the Byzantine habit of copying pictures almost as carefully as Chinese artists are represented as doing, that the picture may be a careful reproduction, once, twice, or three times renewed, of a contemporary at the time of the Council itself.

When I first saw it on the occasion of this visit, I felt that it ought to be copied, or at least carefully preserved. It was then in the church. Some ten years afterwards I paid my second visit to Nicaea, accompanied by the late Mr. Theodore Bent and his wife, who still happily survives, and by my old friend Dr. Long. Three of the party had cameras, and with some difficulty we persuaded the priest to allow us to take the picture, which is about eight feet high, outside the church, in order that we might have abundance of light for photographs of it. All the pictures turned out failures.

Subsequently two friends of mine visited Nicaea and felt confident that they could accomplish it. They also failed. Some years afterwards, meeting Sir Benjamin Stone at dinner with Sir Edwin Egerton, our then Minister in Athens, and having become acquainted with the beautiful work in photography which he had produced, I urged him to come to

Constantinople and thence to go to Nicaea, in order that he might get a good reproduction of the picture in question. We had the pleasure of receiving him in Pera some three years afterwards, and he felt sure that, notwithstanding the picture was a mass of browns, he could overcome the difficulty. He produced some lovely photographs of the gates and other objects in Nicaea, but unfortunately he failed absolutely in doing anything with the picture. On my third visit to Nicaea, accompanied by Miss Dodd of the American College, then at Scutari, who is a clever photographer, by my daughter and a lady who is now Mrs. Hugh Poynter, other attempts were made to reproduce it. All, however, were failures.

In the late autumn of 1876 I paid a visit to Damascus. The visit itself was for professional purposes, which would not interest my readers. As soon as I knew that I was going there I determined, if possible, to make the acquaintance of an elderly lady who had had a remarkable experience. She had been the wife of Lord Ellenborough. She was also the granddaughter of "Coke of Norfolk." Her beauty was as remarkable as her accomplishments and charm. At her coming-out ball she caught the eye of the *bon vivant* Lord Ellenborough, whom she married when not yet seventeen. In 1830 she was divorced and subsequently is credited with having had varied careers with husbands.

I had heard her history before leaving England from Mr. Karl Haag, the well-known painter. He had gone on a sketching expedition into the Syrian desert, and had been accompanied by the lady in question, now fifty years of age, who also possessed very considerable talent in water-colours. The little expedition was under the protection of a Sheik, Abdul Mejuel, a bright, clear-eyed Arab, having a tribe of from two hundred and fifty to three hundred Bedouins under him.

The expedition was a success, Karl Haag obtained the sketches he desired, and the Sheik and the lady fell in love with each other and married. To Europeans she was known

as the Honourable Mrs. Digby. She was, I imagine, thirty years older than he. He was devoted to her service and the two got on very well together. I was told that no European woman knew more of harem life than did she. Her husband's Bedouins were devoted to her, and she exercised remarkable influence over her husband and his men. The difficulty which I anticipated was in getting to see her. Happily I was well acquainted with the director of a bank who had to go twice a year from Beyrout to Damascus to pay her her private income of, I believe, £3,000 a year. On my informing my friend that I wished very much to see her, he told me that she had refused during two or three years to see any European, and that she had even ceased going to the English Church service which had been conducted in the British Consulate at Damascus by a missionary. But my friend promised that he would do his best to overcome for me her repugnance to seeing Europeans.

Accordingly, the day after our arrival, we called at her house, which was in the suburbs of the city. He sent in his name. We were shewn into a long *sala* or drawing-room. A few minutes afterwards I saw a tall woman enter, who at once gave me the impression of having been strikingly handsome; but a black cloud was over her when she saw that my companion, who had come to pay her the money, had with him a stranger. I subsequently learned that she was then in her seventieth year. My friend explained that it was the first time I had been in Damascus, and that he could not leave me in the street, but that with her permission I might go to the other end of the *sala* while the money due to her was counted, accounts made up, and the proper receipts signed. The lady assented but evidently resented the intrusion. I offered to leave the house, but she intimated that if I would adopt the course suggested that would be sufficient.

While business was being transacted between them I examined several paintings which were upon the wall, and at once recognised two from the hand of Karl Haag. As my form of recreation has long been painting in water-colour, I



JANE DIGBY, LADY ELLENBOROUGH

*Reproduced from a photograph of the picture in the Royal Gallery, Munich,
in the possession of Beatrice, Lady Ellenborough*

1. The first part of the book is a general introduction to the study of the history of the world, from the beginning of time to the present day. It covers the major events and figures of world history, and discusses the different theories of the origin of the world and of the human race.

passed a quarter of an hour very pleasantly in looking at the pictures. Business being done, I think it probably occurred to the lady that she could hardly be rude to an Englishman in her own house. She came to my end of the *sala*, and after making some banal remarks, the object of which was to remove any idea of discourtesy, I replied by speaking of my enjoyment of the pictures and specially called attention to one where the painter had caught the atmosphere of the desert. She was interested in my criticisms, and recognising that I knew something of the subject, informed me that the picture in question was painted by her. That broke the ice. We got into an interesting conversation, which ended by her stating that she would have tea on the table every day at five o'clock, and would be very pleased to see me any and every day during the week I proposed to remain in Damascus. She then sent for her husband and introduced us. We became excellent friends, and by his means I was able to get into various mosques and see other sights which I should not have seen but for his assistance.

I availed myself on three or four occasions of her invitation, and found her a close observer, an excellent talker, with keen flashes of insight and wit, and, what interested me most of all, with an experience of harem life of which she spoke frankly, of quite exceptional character. I was especially struck with an observation which she made in different forms on two or three occasions. The women of the harem, said she, had about them the delightfulness of children. Their enjoyments were simple but genuine. Their passionate love of flowers constantly appealed to her, but there was another side to their character. There was the childishness of children which became imbecility when found amongst women. They had sudden outbursts of anger, swift reconciliation, passionate affection, and even hate. The worst side of their character related to their sensuality. They had no pleasures corresponding to those found in European society, no music, no literature, no social intercourse with men. The result was that even amongst the most respectable classes there was a gross sensuality, which shewed

itself in the language which well-dressed harem ladies would employ. Subjects were spoken of even in presence of children about which all Christian races agree to be silent.

She told me many stories of her Eastern experience. On one occasion, by a mistake, the whole of her husband's tribe flocked into Damascus and took possession of her house, sleeping on the stairs, the landings, and anywhere they could lie down. She was the only woman in the house, and could not get into communication with her husband. I made some remark which I forget, intimating that she must have been alarmed with the crowd of these wild fellows. She immediately retorted that she was greatly alarmed, but not, as I appeared to think, at anything which her husband's tribe would do. Her fear was that some of the many Turkish soldiers near her house would make some remark derogatory to her, in which case, she said, not a Turk in the neighbourhood would have been left alive. On mentioning this story to my friend, he said that he entirely believed it, because the attachment of the Bedouins to their chieftain's wife was passionate, and each would have been ready to die for her. She was the only woman whom the Arabs would permit to ride upon a horse.

She had come to exercise an influence over them corresponding to that which a better-known lady of distinction in the East has exercised, namely, Lady Hester Stanhope.

At the end of a week I left Damascus, with hearty good wishes both from the Sheik ul Mejuel and his wife. She died five years afterwards, in 1881. I gained the impression that under different circumstances she might have exerted a most valuable influence in any society into which she had been thrown.

CHAPTER VII

THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION

The Arrival of Sir Henry Layard—Russophobia—Ideals About the Turk—A Scheme of Reform—Sir Henry Disillusioned—Gladstone's Greek Letter—A Scandal—The Khedive's Extravagance—Egypt's Finances—Dual Control—The Succession Changed—The Khedive Deposed—Turkish Alarm—Saving the Sultan's Face—Mr. Goschen Succeeds Sir Henry Layard—Bismarck's Rudeness—The Sultan Obdurate—Mr. Goschen's Victory—The Murder of Colonel Cumaroff.

IN February, 1877, Sir Henry Elliot was granted leave of absence on account of ill-health. Shortly afterwards he was appointed Ambassador in Vienna. In Constantinople he was succeeded by Mr. (afterwards Sir Henry) Austin Layard, who was promoted from Madrid. His recommendation to Mr. Disraeli and his Government was his strong friendliness towards Turkey. As I have already mentioned, he had been connected with Mr. Urquhart and the little knot of able philo-Turks, men who carried their Russophobia to an extreme and, as it appears to me, quite unreasonable degree. One of them boasted to me that he had expended £32,000 out of his own pocket in promoting an insurrection in Circassia against the Russians. I do not suggest that Mr. Layard was an extremist of this kind, but while he was attaché to the British Embassy, some years earlier, and while he made his justly renowned discoveries at Nineveh, he got on well with the Turks, and maintained their friendship.

It was said that he was transferred to Constantinople at his own request. His mission, however, did not prove

a success. The Turks welcomed him because they were foolish enough to suppose that he would support them through thick and thin. He himself believed that he possessed great personal influence with them. I saw him at least once a week, and we constantly discussed the situation, I taking up a friendly attitude of opposition to his views. On one occasion, I remember, he finished his remarks by saying, "At least you must admit that the Turk has a genius for government." My answer was, "That is the one thing for which especially he has no genius." To which his reply was, "You are incorrigible."

Mr. Disraeli's Government recognised that something must be done to amend the system of government under which the Christians, and especially the Armenians, suffered, and accordingly a scheme of reforms was drawn up by Sir Henry Layard and submitted to the Government. It was specially concerned with Armenia. At such time Sir Henry was full of hope, and believed that the Turk would accept anything at his hands. Weeks passed, point after point was discussed, modified or refused, and finally the whole project was rejected. It was a terrible disappointment to Sir Henry. At last something was prepared which was the mere simulacrum of what had been originally proposed. Sir Henry told me what it was, expressed his disappointment at the stubbornness of the Porte, but added, "If I can get this through it will always be something gained." I agreed with him. It was submitted and again modified. His failure had become manifest.

I do not hesitate to say that in the first weeks of my visit I found him so strong an advocate of everything Turkish that I was constantly opposed to his views, but as the weeks drew on I found myself, to my surprise, defending the Turks against his charges. An incident occurred during his ambassadorship which was not without importance. A Turkish subject of Constantinople, known to me, wrote to Mr. Gladstone in Greek. In reply he received a letter from Mr. Gladstone, also in Greek, of which the latter had not taken a copy. Unfortunately the recipient

shewed the letter to the correspondent of a London paper, who gave what proved to be an incorrect version. The correspondent could not read Greek written characters, and probably this may account for the blunder. Sir Henry reported the incident in England from the correspondent's version, and a violent Press attack upon Mr. Gladstone followed. He denied that he had given utterance to the sentiments attributed to him, and Sir Henry, unfortunately for himself, practically gave him the lie. When at last the letter was produced and examined, it was seen that Sir Henry was wrong and Mr. Gladstone right.

When the General Election took place in England, in April, 1880, the Liberal Party came into power, and an outcry was made for the recall of Sir Henry Layard. There had then been published a dispatch from Sir Henry pointing out that the Turks would not consent to make reforms and had refused every suggestion, though made in their interests. The dispatch was taken by English public opinion to be a bid for popular favour. When it appeared I wrote defending Sir Henry Layard, stating that I had seen the change come over his opinions gradually, and that he had been driven by the force of facts to recognise that no reforms could be extracted from the then Sultan Abdul Hamid. I think, however, that the apparent *volte face* which the Ambassador had made might have been forgiven in view of his changed opinions, but the Liberal Party would not forgive the imputation of falsehood to Mr. Gladstone, and accordingly he ceased to be Ambassador in the summer of 1878.

It was while Sir Henry Layard was Ambassador that Ismail, the reigning Khedive of Egypt, was deposed. Ismail had the typical Eastern monarch's idea of the rights of a sovereign. The principal use of a Minister to him was to furnish an unlimited supply of money. He built many palaces and had a large and unusually expensive harem. Let it be said in passing that one of the unsatisfactory features of a harem is that each wife feels bound to obtain as much money and as many jewels as possible to provide for the time when her lord and master shall "put her away" or

enter Paradise. Polygamy has largely decreased in Turkey and Egypt mainly because of its costliness.

In Egypt the holders of Egyptian bonds, most of which were in France or England, were alarmed for their incomes at the extravagance of the Khedive. There were many other complaints against Ismail, forced labour, the indiscriminate use of the kurbash, the neglect of making or keeping roads in repair, the absolute neglect of administration for the benefit of the masses. All these might have been tolerated ; but when the people were so squeezed, the bondholders feared for their dividends. The Khedive was compelled to permit the exercise of a dual financial control for their benefit, under representatives of France and of England. These controllers worked harmoniously, but they soon recognised that the deposition of the great spendthrift Ismail was necessary. They therefore, with the consent of their respective Governments, arranged a plan for deposing him and substituting his son Tewfik. They informed his Vice-regal Majesty that their Governments had decided that he should go. If he went quietly they would allow him a pension of £15,000 a year and certain other privileges, including the recognition of his son as his successor.

As to such recognition, the story is interesting. By law the succession to the Khedivial throne followed the same rule as that to the Sultanate ; that is to say, the eldest male surviving descendant of the original grantee should be the successor. The original grantee was the famous Mehmet Ali, the Albanian. On Ismail's death the heir to the throne would have been Halim Pasha, the son of Mehmet Ali in his old age, and the oldest male descendant. This arrangement Ismail, with the natural love of a father for his own sons, determined to set aside by obtaining an Imperial decree or firman from the Sultan changing the order of succession to that prevailing in most European countries. By dint of heavy expenditure, amounting, it is usually said, to upwards of three millions sterling in cash, of the present of a beautiful yacht most luxuriously fitted up, he succeeded in his object, and obtained a change in the Ottoman law of

succession to the Khedivial throne. The great inducement held out to Ismail to abdicate was that if he did so, his son, by virtue of this change of law, would be allowed to succeed instead of Prince Halim Pasha. When Ismail recognised that England and France were determined to get rid of him, he accepted their proposal. Meantime, however, the Sultan and the Porte knew nothing of what was being done. When the news of the intention of England and France to depose Ismail arrived, the Sultan was in great alarm, and declared that nothing could more lessen his reputation among his own subjects than that such a change should be made without his knowledge or consent. But time was pressing, as the change was imminent. He called a meeting of his Ministers at the palace and discussed the matter with them until after midnight.

A case was subsequently brought into the Court of Queen's Bench in London to recover a large sum of money, in reference to which the verdict would have turned on the question whether a firman had been effectually obtained from the Sultan changing the order of succession. It was on this occasion that I learned exactly what happened at the palace. The problem was, how, while admitting that Ismail was certain to be deposed on the following day, to persuade the Turkish population that such act had been done by the Sultan. After midnight Caratheodori suggested a course which, after it had been thoroughly discussed, was recognised as the only one which would serve the purpose. Caratheodori was given *carte blanche* to telegraph to Paris and Egypt on behalf of the Sultan.

Three telegrams were sent which were subsequently published in the French Yellow Book. In the one addressed to Munir Pasha, the Turkish Ambassador in France, he was informed that his Majesty, having long seen the misgovernment of Egypt by Ismail and his extravagance, had decided to depose him and had done so. Another telegram was sent, also in the name of the Sultan, to Ismail himself, informing him that for like reasons his Majesty had no further need for his services, but that out of ancient affection he permitted

his son to take his place. A third telegram formally appointed Tewfik, his eldest son, as Khedive. All these telegrams were drawn up in the telegraph office. I may add that when the English Blue Book of that time relating to Egypt came out there appeared a dispatch sent to Sir Henry Layard at Constantinople, which referred to the telegram that had been received in Paris and remarked that this move of Abdul Hamid would probably facilitate the operation which the two Governments had in hand.

Ismail went away quietly and took up his residence with his large family near Naples. The deposition of one ruler and the appointment of his successor, Tewfik, took place in June, 1879. I am not aware that the story of the deposition has ever been told by any other person than by me. It is interesting to add that the present Grand Vizier of Turkey, Prince Said Halim, is the eldest son of Halim, who but for the change of succession would have become Khedive on the death of Ismail.

The last time I saw Sir Henry Layard was on the Quai at Lucerne. I was going to church one Sunday morning with my two children when to my surprise we encountered Sir Henry and Lady Layard, who were also going to church. He suggested that my children should accompany Lady Layard and that he and I should return to his hotel and talk about the situation in Turkey. He mentioned many interesting facts. Some of the English papers had been foolish enough to suggest that he was taking bribes from the Sultan. The suggestion was, of course, absurd. On one occasion when he had dined at the palace he had stated that he could not get such good bread as was set before him. Thereupon the Sultan insisted upon sending him bread daily, and a number of other smaller presents of little or no value, which he could not refuse without giving offence. He produced a watch which the Sultan had almost forced upon him which he did not believe was worth a couple of pounds.

Let me say in reference to Lady Layard that she acquired the esteem of everybody in Constantinople whose goodwill



Phot.

SIR HENRY AUSTIN LAYARD

Elliott & Fry, Ltd.

1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

was worth having ; and many years afterwards, her husband being then dead, when I wanted to get a copy of the famous portrait of Mahomet the Conqueror, by Gentili Bellini, the original of which had been obtained by Sir Henry, she had it photographed specially for me, took the trouble also to send me from Venice her husband's presentation copy of Vassari's *Lives*, and offered to furnish any information in her power which I might want.

After the General Election in the United Kingdom of 1880, Sir Henry Layard ceased to be Ambassador in Constantinople. He was succeeded by Mr. George J. Goschen, who went on a "special mission" to Constantinople, without emolument, and, with the consent of his constituents, retained his seat in Parliament. The special object of his mission was to compel Turkey to carry out certain provisions of the Treaty of Berlin which she had hitherto neglected to do.

It will be remembered that after the signature of the Treaty of San Stefano, England, with the consent of others of the European Powers, insisted upon a Congress to revise such Treaty. It met in Berlin and a Treaty embodying the results of its labours was concluded in July, 1878. Its most distinguished men were Mr. Disraeli, Lord Salisbury, and Prince Bismarck. It made many important additions and modifications to the Treaty which it had to revise. The most important was to cut down the dimensions of Bulgaria and to provide that the Principality of Bulgaria should only be that portion of territory which was north of the Balkans. The country to its south, largely diminished in extent from the boundaries prescribed in the San Stefano Treaty, was to be called Eastern Rumelia and was to continue to be under the suzerainty of the Sultan. Its Governor, however, was to be a Christian, named by the sovereign with the consent of the Great Powers.

We can all recognise now that it was a foolish arrangement, because the people of south Bulgaria, as nearly everybody chose to call Eastern Rumelia, being of the same race, religion, and language as those of the Principality, would

only consent to be separated from their brethren so long as they were prevented by actual force. Indeed, this opposition was anticipated by the Congress, and a provision was inserted in the Treaty allowing Turkish troops to be sent by the Sultan to Philippopolis and other parts of the province in case of revolt.

At the Congress the principal representative of Turkey was Alexander Pasha Caratheodori, a Greek of quite exceptional ability, who was Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, and who struggled to preserve the interests of his master as stoutly as any man could do. He was constantly and rudely snubbed by Bismarck, who told him in so many words that he was there only to accept what the Powers dictated. Incidentally I may mention that during my forty-two years' residence in Turkey, Caratheodori was, with one exception, the only Christian ever allowed to be Minister of Foreign Affairs, the tradition being that a Giaour should occupy that office whenever territory had to be ceded, the evident intention being that any odium connected with such surrender should not fall upon a Believer. While the rule holds good which I have mentioned, it is also true that throughout Turkish history the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs has almost invariably been a Christian.

When Mr. Goschen came to Constantinople he at once set himself to urge the Porte to fulfil its obligations regarding Greece, Montenegro, and Bulgaria. Of all the eleven British Ambassadors I have seen in Constantinople, he impressed me most with his thorough business aptitude and tact. He took everything that he had to do very seriously. I remember, for example, going to see him in reference to a debt of some thousands of pounds due to one of my clients, and represented by *havales*, upon one of the Turkish Provincial Governments. Mr. Goschen listened carefully to the whole of my story and saw at once that the case was a proper one for ambassadorial support. He explained that he had often heard *havales* spoken of and that as he wanted to understand how they were worked he would be glad if I would

place one or more in his hands and let him try to collect the money. I, of course, replied that I was delighted to do so, and sent him all the *havales* referring to the debt in question. "I shall then," said he, "get an idea of the working and of the difficulties which have so often been complained of." He put the machinery of the Embassy and Consulates in motion to obtain payment, but did not succeed, though after his departure my client, probably by making the usual arrangement to pay a large percentage to the Governor and other officials, obtained a part of his money.

Mr. Goschen had not been long in Constantinople before he was able to come to an agreement in reference to the clauses regarding Greece and Bulgaria. As to Montenegro, the Porte and Sultan Abdul Hamid personally were more obstinate. The Mountain State had had its independence acknowledged for the first time by European Treaty. Berlin had declared that the port of Antivari on the Adriatic should be given to it. The Sultan stated that he would never consent to such sacrifice. But Mr. Gladstone was behind Mr. Goschen, and a combination between them was bound to effect its purpose. A naval demonstration had been arranged in which men-of-war of various nations appeared before Antivari and Dulcigno, and it was hoped that this would compel the acquiescence of the Sultan. When it failed to do so, and when the ships of all other nations withdrew, Mr. Goschen went to the palace to deliver an ultimatum. The event was a trying one, because against him were joined the traditions of Turkey and the not too friendly sentiments of ambassadors whose ships had left England to deal alone with Turkey. The position required a man of exceptional nerve. A friend who accompanied the Ambassador to Abdul Hamid told me that Mr. Goschen's lip trembled and that he was evidently highly strung when he informed the Sultan that if he did not give way British ships would occupy an important port in his dominions and hold it until he had yielded.

The position was especially anxious, because one after another the ships of various nations had left the English

detachment alone, and the Sultan believed that England would not risk war now she stood alone. The Concert of Europe, to which Mr. Gladstone always attached importance and which Abdul Hamid dreaded, had proved a broken reed. The Sultan had only England to reckon with. He refused to yield. The story in Constantinople was that during the evening of the day when Mr. Goschen presented the ultimatum, the Sultan gave way to an exceptional access of anger and professed that he would be happy if he could see London destroyed. In the meantime the clear-headed and determined Ambassador had taken his measures. Probably no one in Constantinople but himself knew what had been proposed. The ships in the Adriatic were ready to heave anchor at a moment's notice and to leave under sealed orders. Everything indeed was ready for departure and their signals were "bent on," when it was reported to the Admiral that a boat was coming from the shore and that someone in it was frantically waving a paper. The messenger arrived bringing the announcement that the Sultan had given way. It was not till three months afterwards, when Parliament had risen, that the public learned that the sealed orders were for the occupation of Smyrna. It was distinctly a case of a "spirited foreign policy" which it was the fashion at that day to intimate that the Liberal Party were incapable of shewing.

It was whilst Mr. Goschen was Ambassador that there occurred an incident which was illustrative of Turkish opinion. A certain Colonel Cumaroff, a man greatly respected, was the military attaché of the Russian Embassy. He was riding in the principal street of Pera, about a mile and a half distant from the Embassy, when a Moslem stepped out into the road, took deliberate aim and shot him dead. The incident made a great sensation. The Sultan, in order to satisfy foreign public opinion, put the man on his trial for wilful murder before a special court, at which one or more representatives of each Embassy was present. The case was perfectly clear; the man avowed his guilt, and was sentenced to death.



THE AMERICAN LEGATION, CONSTANTINOPLE
GROUP OF AMBASSADORS AT CONSTANTINOPLE

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

I was not present when the following incident occurred. It was related to me by the late Hobart Pasha, an English naval officer, brother of Lord Hobart, who had been President of the Imperial Ottoman Bank. The Pasha met me on the evening of one of the early days of the trial, and expressed his regret that I had not been present in court as he had been. We had been speaking together two days earlier of the attitude of mind of Moslems of the baser sort towards Christians, and I had expressed the opinion that they thought of us as inferior beings. The Pasha remarked that had I been there I should have seen a remarkable confirmation of my opinion. The prisoner was asked after he had admitted that he shot Cumaroff, "Did you know that he was a Christian?" In reply he turned indignantly to his judges and said, "Of course I did. You do not suppose that I would shoot a Believer, do you?" Hobart said his answer was as if he had been asked, "Did you know that Cumaroff was a dog?" "You don't think I am capable of shooting a man, do you?"

Although the prisoner was condemned, days and weeks passed, and in spite of the representations of the Russian Embassy the man was not executed. Mr. Goschen himself told me that he had informed the Russian Ambassador that he and all his colleagues would support him if he pressed for execution. Finally the Russian Ambassador concluded that Abdul Hamid dare not have him hanged. He wished to appear to his subjects as the protector of Moslems against Christians, and the Ambassador told Mr. Goschen they "would have to put the murder in the bill," meaning, of course, in the list of grievances that was already beginning to accumulate against Abdul Hamid. The man never was executed.

A case happened about the same time of the murder of an American missionary near Ismidt. Here also, in spite of many representations made to the Government and of the fact that the murderer was well known, no redress was granted. A Christian subject of the Sultan remarked to me at the time of both these cases, "You see that Abdul Hamid is even worse than his predecessors, because even

when the victim is a foreigner of distinction, all the Powers of Europe cannot exact justice from him. What chance do you think we natives should have?" The remark conveyed the truth. There were constantly offences committed by Moslems against Christians for which not only was there no redress but the people did not expect any.

When the objects of Mr. Goschen's special mission were accomplished, namely in June, 1881, he returned to England.

CHAPTER VIII

EGYPT

Lord Dufferin Appointed Ambassador—The Revolt of Arabi Pasha—Turkish Pin-pricks—The Bombardment of Alexandria—Tel-el-Kebir—The British Left to Restore Order—Turkey's Help Solicited—The Sultan's Refusal—Baker Pasha's Anxiety—Mr. Gladstone Determined—British Troops Land—Lord and Lady Dufferin's Services to the European Colony—The Girls' High School—Lady Dufferin's Popularity—A Courteous but Strong Ambassador—A Broad-minded Man.

MR. GOSCHEN was succeeded by Lord Dufferin, who had been for a short time Ambassador in St. Petersburg, which he left in June, 1881. After his arrival he soon found himself engaged in a very serious business, for in September of that year the curious revolt of Arabi Pasha occurred. It must be remembered that Egypt was still under the rule of the Sultan, who, like his predecessors, attached the utmost importance to the retention of his sovereign rights over that country. Ismail Pasha, the Khedive, as already stated, had been deposed, granted a generous pension, and succeeded by his son Tewfik.

During a time of great trouble and anxiety, Lord Dufferin proved that though he was a man of a courtesy so extreme and genuine as to suggest that he had kissed the blarney stone, he well understood the maxim *fortiter in re, suaviter in modo*. The impression he at first created at the palace and amongst the Turkish Ministers was, and continued to be for some time after his arrival, that he was so complacent or even weak that they could do anything they liked with him. They remarked that he was an Irishman,

and not an Englishman. A Minister commented on this to me, and felt sure that he was especially favourable to everything Turkish. I reminded them that in 1860 he had commenced his career—when sent to enquire into the massacres on the Lebanon—by hanging two Pashas. “He has learned wisdom since then,” was the reply.

A fussy official objected to foreigners displaying their national flags on Sundays or holidays, and induced the Grand Vizier to make a representation to Lord Dufferin and other Ambassadors by which the subjects under their protection were forbidden to hoist their flags—just one of those silly, useless, and annoying things which a certain class of Turkish official is constantly doing. Lord Dufferin yielded to their request. The Turks at once pointed to him as a more sincere friend than his predecessor Sir Henry Layard. I remember talking over with him this and two or three other questions, one regarding the British Post Office and the other having reference to the International Sanitary Commission, in each of which he had given way to Turkish demands. He made light of them, but remarked that when you are likely to have a controversy with a man, it was especially necessary to be civil and courteous towards him.

The great controversy which he probably then had in view regarded Egypt. In order to understand what he had to do, an explanation is necessary. In the previous year Arabi and Mahmud had formed a military committee which aimed at cleansing the army of its Turkish officers and the country of foreigners generally. They organised demonstrations outside the Khedive's palace, at which the cry was, “Egypt for the Egyptians!” In February, 1882, they forced on the Khedive an administration of their own with Mahmud at the head and Arabi as Minister of War. The European Concert was invoked and a conference held at Constantinople. There was a conspiracy to assassinate Arabi and to dethrone the Khedive in April.

Rioting took place at Alexandria and Cairo in June. Alexandria was fortified, and both England and France protested against the misgovernment of Arabi and the



THE MARQUESS OF DUFFERIN AND AVA

fortification. The British threatened bombardment, and shortly afterwards Admiral Seymour destroyed its forts, July 10, 1882, the French fleet taking no part in the operation. About 5,000 British soldiers were landed at the end of the same month. Arabi attempted to cut off the water supply, whereupon the Khedive declared him a rebel. On July 24 Arabi proclaimed a *Jehad*, or Holy War.

On the 31st the French fleet withdrew, and a few days afterwards Suez was occupied by British marines. Sir Garnet Wolseley landed at Alexandria and assumed command. A brilliant movement was effected by Sir Garnet at Tel-el-Kebir in September. On the 12th of that month he had advanced with 11,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry, and forty guns from Ismailia on the Canal. The victorious British army entered Cairo on September 14. The Khedive himself made a formal triumphant entry on the 25th. To complete this portion of my story I may add that on November 9 formal notice was given by England of the abandonment of the Anglo-French control, which ceased on January 11, 1883. Arabi, it will be remembered, was sent as a prisoner to Ceylon.

Two questions of special interest arose during these events. The first regarded common action with France. From a variety of causes friction between England and France had been growing. As the Dual Control had worked with a fair amount of success and satisfaction, the two Governments of England and France considered it essential that they should continue to work together for the good of the country, and therefore in opposition to the party of Arabi. England was most anxious to have the co-operation of France in all that she undertook in Egypt. The French joined with us for a while, but, as we have seen, at a crucial moment their fleet quitted Egyptian waters and left us to restore order and establish the authority of the Khedive. My sympathies as an Englishman were naturally with our own people, and I, like every other Englishman in Constantinople, regretted that France should have left us in the lurch.

I may anticipate some two years and mention that at the end of that time I met an old friend of mine, a Frenchman, clear-headed and honest, who had been connected with the Control in Egypt. In the course of our conversation I put the question to him in this fashion, "Forget that I am an Englishman and that you are a Frenchman, and tell me as an old friend: were we justified in acting against Egypt when your fleet had gone away? What is the true story?" He looked at me for some time and then said, "Well, as you put it to me on the ground of our old friendship, I will tell you the position. There was a *canaille* in Egypt, and especially in Cairo, that from the first believed it in their interest that France should not act with you. I believe that every honest Frenchman in France would agree with these propositions: first, that you frankly invited us to act with you because you wanted our aid and believed that the Dual Control was beneficial to Egypt as well as to the two countries. Secondly, that you had so pledged yourselves to assist the Khedive in restoring order that you could not possibly abstain from action without dishonour; further, that you did your best to induce us to join you, and that the great majority of thoughtful Frenchmen in Egypt recognised these facts, believed even that you would come in whether we joined you or not, and therefore urged our Government to take common action. But the opposite party made a furious hubbub in the Egyptian Press, sent absurd telegrams to Gambetta, declaring amongst other things that England would not venture upon naval and military operations without the co-operation of France. This party triumphed, as we foresaw that it would." "But was our conduct quite correct?" "Yes, absolutely. You could not get out of it honourably."

Now returning to Lord Dufferin's share in the matter, I continue my narrative regarding the second question with which he had to deal. Mr. Gladstone's Government was most anxious to obtain the co-operation of the Turkish Government, especially on the defection of the French. He recognised, of course, that the Sultan was the suzerain of the Khedive, and he did not wish to do anything which should

be or appear to be against the interests of Turkey. Lord Dufferin was therefore instructed to request Turkey to send a number of troops who should enter the country when ours did, and thus assist in preserving the rights of the suzerain. Lord Dufferin soon found that some of the Powers, with France at their head, were using their influence with the Sultan to persuade him to refuse the demand of England. The diplomatic world in Constantinople was intensely excited, the great questions being would Turkey consent or not? would England dare to enter Egypt without the support of the Turkish troops now that France had withdrawn her fleet? It was, in fact, the commencement of a period of pin-pricks, during which France was as nearly hostile to England as she could be without furnishing a *casus belli*.

When the British proposal had been presented by Lord Dufferin to the Porte, he was worried almost daily by suggestions and proposed modifications on the part of Turkish Ministers. Thereupon he took a step which was characteristic of the man. He possessed a very beautiful little yacht in which, accompanied by Lady Dufferin, he was fond of running down to the Island of Prinkipo, which has been my residence during the summer for many years past, and where on more than one occasion I have raced with him between the city and the point in the island known as the Glossa. To the Glossa he came one day in his yacht and anchored on the south side of it. The launch belonging to the Embassy Dispatch boat brought him letters daily, but the general belief in the city was that he had gone for a cruise. In any case he was not get-at-able.

At that time Baker Pasha, otherwise Colonel Valentine Baker, lived on the island almost opposite to me. He had thrown in his lot heart and soul with Turkey. Usually he went to town in his own steam launch. But I saw him nearly every night, and a very curious experience I had. He began by expressing his opinion that as a matter of course Turkey would accede to the wishes of England and send an army. On the second or third meeting during an eventful week he

began to be doubtful. At the palace, to which he went every day, the Sultan had been persuaded that England dare not enter Egypt unless Turkish troops entered also. Baker had replied that they did not know the British Government, which, having pledged its word to go in, would enter with the Turks or without them. Nor did they know Mr. Gladstone. "'Twas not a case," said he, "of not daring to go in without the Turks, but of not daring to violate his word."

Some fools at the palace had told them that the Tories would be delighted if the Sultan refused, because the rebuff to Gladstone, who was regarded as the arch-enemy of Turkey, would be a great weapon in the hands of the Opposition. Baker Pasha replied that he did not belong to the Gladstonian party, but to the Opposition, and that under the circumstances such a move would be out of the frying-pan into the fire. But invariably the Sultan and those who reflected his influence came back to the statement that England dare not enter except with the permission of Turkey and with Turkish troops.

We all knew the English army was in Egypt* and we conjectured, though we did not know, that Mr. Gladstone's Government would recognise that delay itself meant defeat. Lord Dufferin knew more, and while urging the Turks in every possible way to send troops, as the week drew to an end he became anxious for news. The Sultan also became anxious, and on a particular day—if my memory serves me, a Saturday—Lord Dufferin received an urgent message to go to the palace. He of course complied. He went in the morning, and had submitted to him various projects which he informed His Majesty he was not authorised to discuss. The one question between them was would His Majesty send troops immediately. No Turk ever does anything immediately, and no man believes more firmly than does a Turkish ruler that in the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom.

Lord Dufferin was kept there the whole of the afternoon

* Some 40,000 men under Sir Garnet Wolseley and General Macpherson, who was in command of the Indian Contingent,

and could not get away even for dinner. Finally, after dinner he insisted upon going. He left, and started for his house at Therapia, greatly distressed and marvelling that he had received no telegram from Egypt. Half-way home he met his secretary and others coming towards him, and the first impatient question was, "Has the telegram arrived?" Yes, it had arrived, two or three hours, I forget which, previously, but had taken long in decoding. Wolseley had landed on the canal. The British troops were advancing.

I saw Baker Pasha, who on the previous day had been terribly alarmed at the failure of his endeavours to persuade the Turks that England would enter Egypt with or without the Turks. "They are mad," said he. "They have so high an opinion of their own importance that they are firmly persuaded that we are simply bluffing and would not venture to land without a Turkish force." He had reminded them that they had held a similar opinion of Mr. Goschen, but had wisely given way at the last moment and thus saved Turkey from the humiliation of seeing its great port of Smyrna placed under the domination of British guns. Their reply had been that there was no proof of that, and that at any rate at that time, though the French and other fleets had left ours alone at Antivari, the French and other Powers were now supporting Turkey, and advised the Sultan not to send troops. Poor Baker was in despair. He left the city next day in a steamer without bidding good-bye to the Sultan or any of the Turkish Ministers, and started for Egypt. The Turkish official papers, as soon as his departure was known, denounced him, probably on orders from the palace, as a traitor. The denunciation was silly and useless, did him no harm and them no good. On reaching Egypt he was at once appointed commander of a new Egyptian army.

Before taking leave of Baker Pasha, a few lines may be added as to his future career. Great troubles had arisen in the Sudan, where, under the Mahdi, named Mahomet Achmed, an insurrection occurred in 1881. After several small skirmishes the Mahdi massacred 6,000 Egyptians in

June, 1882. Then an Egyptian army, under Hicks Pasha, was sent against him. This army of 11,000 men was destroyed. Meantime Baker had been engaged in the discipline of the force placed under his command. His army took the field after Hicks' disaster. A battle took place near Tokar, to the west of the harbour of Sudan, in which again the Mahdi was successful. Baker's men made a better stand than did those of Hicks, but nevertheless they were so badly beaten that Baker was in despair. He died shortly afterwards in Egypt.

Lord and Lady Dufferin were always ready while in Constantinople to support any movement in furtherance of education or of other useful objects. Dr. Washburn, Dr. Long, Dr. Patterson the surgeon of the British Seamen's Home in Constantinople, the Rev. George Washington, who was the British Embassy Chaplain and the head of the elder branch of the family to which the great American belonged, and I, regretting the absence of any means by which girls beyond the school age, which usually terminated at fourteen, could continue their education, had a private meeting at which we formed ourselves into a committee for the formation of ladies' classes, and each of us undertook to give a course of lectures. Subsequently we had the advantage of the aid of Dr. Alexander van Millingen, the son of the medical man who attended Lord Byron in his last illness, and who was, and still is, Professor of History at Robert College.

The classes supplied a want. We charged only a small fee to cover expenses, and had girls belonging to many nationalities. In this and in other similar matters Lord Dufferin gave his cordial support. He was greatly interested, especially in the progress of Robert College, and, like every other British Ambassador in Constantinople, very highly valued the soundness of judgment and the fulness of information which Dr. Washburn especially possessed in regard to all the races in the Turkish Empire. I may mention that Dr. Washburn wrote a volume which in a

certain sense may be called his autobiography, but it is so occupied with his educational work at Robert College that it does not give any indication of the way in which he was trusted by all the competent British Ambassadors during his fifty years in Turkey.

Lord Dufferin took great interest in the revival of the English High School for girls. Its history is interesting. Towards the end of the Crimean war Sultan Abdul Mejid, the father of Abdul Hamid, granted two pieces of property to the English and French respectively for the establishment of girls' schools. As at that time landed property could not be inscribed in the name of a foreigner—and the only title deed recognised in Turkish land law is an inscription or a legalised copy of such inscription in the public land register—the difficulty of making a title had to be surmounted by a well-recognised Turkish fiction. In conformity with this fiction every woman is a Turkish subject. Accordingly the property was inscribed in the name of the wife of Stratford Canning, afterwards Lady Stratford de Redcliffe.

The property was situated in the very best part of the chief street in Pera, and consisted of a huge, rambling old Turkish house, which during the Crimean war had been a café and the rendezvous of French and English officers. When this was converted into a school Lady Canning took great interest in it, had a class for the pupils round at the Embassy every week, and exercised an influence upon the girls of various nationalities which was altogether beneficial and is still gratefully remembered by many old ladies in Pera. The school was open to girls of all nationalities, but the language was to be English. So long as Lady Canning remained, and for a few years after her departure, the school was a success. Then, probably owing to the difficulty of finding a suitable head-teacher, the number of pupils decreased, and when I arrived in Constantinople the institution was closed.

Upon learning some three or four years afterwards that, as part of the grant, there were a number of shops which

produced good rents, some of us concluded that the position was a scandal, and that steps should be taken to reopen the institution. We were met by the statement that the land and buildings were the private property of Lady Canning, and that no useful action could be taken. Further enquiry led me and others to conclude that this was not the case, and the matter was submitted by some of us to Mr. Morgan Foster, the Director-General of the Ottoman Bank, with a request that he would see Sir Henry Layard on the subject and ask him to communicate with Lady Stratford de Redcliffe, as she then was. Mr. Foster was always ready to do what he could for the advantage of the British community and undertook the task. Sir Henry communicated with Lady Stratford de Redcliffe, who, although she was aware that the land was inscribed in her name, recognised at once that she was only a trustee, and wisely put the matter into the hands of her solicitors. Negotiations followed, and after full enquiries, a trust deed was drawn up dealing with the property, appointing a Committee for the conduct of the school, and making provisions for its management.

Meantime Turkish land law had been changed, and permission had been given to inscribe property in the name of a corporation sole, such as an Embassy or a Consulate. The school was opened, and after a tentative effort, which was not altogether successful, we appointed a head-mistress, or, as the Trust Deed calls her, a Lady Directress, and a staff of teachers. The Committee took over the management of the shops in question, and for twenty years the old ramshackle Turkish café was a great success as a school. The community took great interest in it, and about two hundred girls attended, an attendance which has virtually kept at that up to the present time.

About fourteen years ago municipal requirements demanded that a considerable portion of our frontage should be given to the high street of Pera, and the Committee took the opportunity of putting up a new set of buildings in which, under Miss Greene, and subsequently Miss Charters, the school has been an unqualified success. I may be excused

for mentioning that I have been Chairman of this Committee during the last fifteen years.

On the outbreak of war in November last, following the bombardment of Odessa, the police appeared at the school, gave the scholars and teachers ten minutes' notice, and three days afterwards took possession of the buildings and converted them into a Turkish boys' school. I was still in Constantinople, and was amused at hearing of the remark of one of the persons whose duty it was to take over the school, that "this was as stupid a business as he had ever known, because every Turk knew that sooner or later they would have to clear out of the building and pay for the damage done."

At no time during my residence in Turkey was the British Embassy so completely the centre of social life as during that of the Dufferins. This was due as much to Lady Dufferin as to her husband. Each displayed energy and tact, and showed a desire to be agreeable to their public, and did it in such a charming way as to make them both highly popular. The handsome ballroom of the Embassy was converted at times into a theatre, and a number of performances took place in which the principal players were Lady Dufferin and members of the Staff, or if, as was usually the case, one of the pieces was in French, there would be members of some other Embassy.

I have pleasant recollections of these various performances, but of one in particular. I cannot recall the name of the piece, but in the course of it there appeared a waiter who was a glorious pessimist. If the day promised to be fine, he would remark that such days usually ended in rain, or storm, and so on. The audience enjoyed this character more than that of any other in the piece. When it was over I was at the refreshment table when Lord Dufferin came up and asked how I liked the piece. I, of course, said I had enjoyed it, but I fancied that the pessimist in question did not exist in the piece as it was written. I suggested that it had been adapted by Lord Dufferin himself and that the character of


Wilson in his *Letters from High Latitudes* had been worked in as the pessimist. Lord Dufferin seemed surprised, and at once admitted it was so, adding that he expected that I was the only man in the audience who knew anything about Wilson or thought that he, Lord Dufferin, had any hand in writing the piece. This led the conversation to the subject of Wilson, and I asked if he was a real character as represented in the letters. He assured me that he was, and then told me certain details about him. I informed him that I had read the book in high latitudes, fifty-eight degrees south, near Cape Horn. Next day, with the kindliness that characterised him, he sent me a charming letter stating that as I was interested in the fate of Wilson he begged me to accept the latest edition of the *Letters from High Latitudes*, in which I should find additional particulars about the pessimist.

The question has often been raised as to who are the men who get through most work. Are they those who work constantly at a subject without relaxation? Nearly fifty years ago I made the acquaintance of Mr. Edwin Field. It was at the time when the new Law Courts were about to be built. I bring in his name here as a contributor to the discussion of the questions just suggested. The theory which he held was that a man should have only one subject for work and one hobby, and in that way he maintained he would make the most of his life. Lord Dufferin had very much the same kind of theory, except that both as to work and to hobbies he was more liberal. He took a broad, statesmanlike view of political questions, and left details to be worked out by his subordinates. He had the capacity of utilising other men. But woe to the subordinate who acted contrary to his wishes!

I happened to be present on one occasion when a Consul, who was never distinguished for good judgment, took it upon himself to act directly against his orders. Lord Dufferin let out at him so strongly that I rose and said, "I think I ought not to be present." He put his arm in front of me and said, "Sit down, Pears. This does not concern you,



THE MARCHIONESS OF DUFFERIN AND AVA



but don't go." Lord Dufferin knew what he wanted, and would have it done as he wanted. Then as to his hobby. I remember him telling me that when he had done his work an exciting novel was the best form of relaxation he could take. But I soon found that he had another hobby: he drew and painted excellently for an amateur, the particular form which he favoured being in pastel.

In all that he did Dufferin was the grand seigneur, a gentleman outwardly and inwardly. I had lunched and dined at his table several times before I heard that he was a teetotaler. There was always a liberal assortment of wines of which I took my share, but after I had been informed that the host was an abstainer, I watched him with some care. He would pass the decanter readily or call out to a man across the table to pass it on, and I remember especially one occasion when I was at his right hand and the port was offered me, he remarked, "Try that. I don't drink port, but they tell me that's a very good sample." Had I not known my man, I should have supposed that his abstention was only from port, instead of from everything alcoholic. But that was the man.

As I have referred to Mr. Edwin Field, I may mention how I first came to make his acquaintance. It was early in 1869, shortly after I had been elected General Secretary of the Social Science Association. Its legal section included men of great eminence in both branches of the profession. A sub-committee had been formed which ultimately succeeded in persuading Mr. Gladstone, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the Suitors' Fund could be properly applied to the construction of new Law Courts. Mr. Gladstone, who was always intensely conservative in the matter of the expenditure of public money, required a good deal of convincing before he assented to the proposal. For the benefit of non-legal readers I may explain that the fund in question is the accumulation of money in the Chancery and other Courts, the owners of which could not be found. It had gone on accumulating from about 1688. The Committee took up

the ground that the likelihood upon the doctrine of chances showed it to be impossible that anything like half of such fund could ever be claimed.

The Committee stuck to its task, and at the time when I became its secretary had to submit a resolution to the Government of very great importance. I knew absolutely nothing about the subject, but met about eighteen or twenty members perhaps who were deeply interested. Three-quarters of an hour passed, resolution after resolution was proposed, and, finally, I took down one which the Committee proposed to adopt. During the discussion, one member after another had said, "Where is Mr. Field?" At the last moment a tall, well-built man rushed into the room making profuse excuses for being late, and explaining to everybody's satisfaction how it had been impossible for him to arrive earlier. He then asked, "What have you done?" I read the resolution. He said at once, "That won't do." In three minutes he had convinced everybody in the room that it would not do. He then dictated to me another resolution, and in three or four minutes had persuaded everybody in the room that that was the right thing to adopt. In ten minutes or a quarter of an hour the Committee broke up. I was astonished at the influence he possessed over a number of experts, all of intelligence well above the average, and at the clear-headedness of the man. As the chairman of the Committee remained behind I asked him, "Who is Mr. Field?"

"Why do you ask?"

"Because I never met a man who seemed to have such influence upon his fellow-men."

The Chairman said, "You are quite right. I never understood how Oliver became Protector of the Commonwealth of England until I met Edwin Field, and he is Cromwell's direct descendant."

The financial difficulties as to the erection of the Law Courts were overcome. Half a dozen sets of plans were provided at public expense and exhibited in sheds constructed for the purpose in Lincoln's Inn. An excellent

Committee made a selection from them, and chose that of Mr. Street. The building, however, was not constructed after Mr. Street's designs. Mr. Ayton, the Member, I think, for the Tower Hamlets, who prided himself upon his strict regard for economy, called on Mr. Street and told him that he must cut the expenses down considerably. This could only be done by altering the central hall. Such hall was really the culmination, artistically, of the group of buildings. Had it been allowed to remain, the Law Courts would have been the most conspicuous and magnificent work of Gothic art which London possesses. The cry of economy in such a case was futile. Money was not taken out of anybody's pocket, and so a unique opportunity of adorning London was lost through Mr. Ayton's desire to gain credit for economy. It was not even a case of pandering to a popular cry, because no such outcry existed.

In the year before I left London for Constantinople, I edited the *Law Magazine*, and in order to give an account of the Law Courts, which were then in course of construction, I went to see Mr. Street. He stated plainly that his plans had been ruined by Mr. Ayton, but that he could not afford to lose his commission on the work. I sympathised with his bitterness.

CHAPTER IX

ABDUL HAMID

The Sultan's Superstition—Abdul Hamid's Hostility to Armenians—The Turkish Law of Succession—Its Disadvantages—Abdul Hamid's Upbringing—A Narrow Environment—The Fleet Neglected—Abdul Hamid's Sensitiveness to Criticism—An Unofficial Censorship—A Continuous Foreign Policy—An Avengement for the Evacuation of Egypt—The Sultan Refuses His Consent—Lord Salisbury's Rejoinder—A Prosperous Egypt—Izzet Pasha—The Two Secretaries—Belief in Astrologers—The Tabah Affair—The Sultan's "Diplomatic Victory"—A Suspicious Monarch—An Elaborate Spying System—Blackmail—The Censors Regard Me as Incorrigible—I am Threatened with Expulsion—Turkish "Decorations"—A Clever Fraud.

LORD DUFFERIN was appointed Viceroy of India in September, 1884. As for some time previous to his departure, and afterwards, there were no specially burning questions between Turkey and the other Powers, this is a convenient place to speak of the Sultan. When I arrived in the country Abdul Aziz was on the throne. He was a harmless sort of Eastern sovereign, who was not generally disliked by his subjects, and who probably thought of his own pleasures more than anything else. His hobby was building. The beautiful palace of Dolma Bagsche, about two miles from Seraglio Point and one of the most conspicuous objects on the Bosphorus, was completed in his reign. It was rumoured that the Sultan was unwilling to occupy it on account of some superstitious fear. The palace of Cheragan, which nearly adjoins it, also on the Bosphorus, was already constructed.

The beautiful smaller palaces at Begler Bey, which had been used as the residence of the Empress Eugénie previous to my going to Constantinople, another at Beikos, and one at the Sweet Waters of Europe were the principal. In addition he had proposed to build a magnificent mosque on a prominent site at the back of Dolma Babsche, and at his death the foundations had been everywhere laid and the external walls run up to a height of about ten feet. It is a superstition among the Turks that no Sultan should complete a building commenced by his predecessor. The result is that to this hour the remains of the intended mosque look like a superb ruin.

Public opinion in Turkey could hardly be said at any time to have existed outside Constantinople. But in that city there was a strong party opposed to the Sultan on account of his extravagance, and the show of palaces was the ever-present evidence of his failing. There was also a small group of men who wished to transform the absolutism of the Government into a limited monarchy, and to establish a Constitution. Amongst them Midhat Pasha was the leader. They succeeded in bringing about the revolution which placed Murad on the throne, which deposed him and appointed Abdul Hamid as his successor. It was not a military revolution, and though both soldiers and sailors took part in it, the movement was as spontaneous as such a change could be. After the short attempt at parliamentary government and the packing off of the members from the capital, Sultan Abdul Hamid soon showed himself bitterly hostile to all projects of parliamentary government, or to anything which should tend to diminish his absolute power. He is a man of a certain amount of cunning, but also of a meanness of character which is not Turkish. He was often spoken of as an Armenian or a half Armenian, and as these epithets undoubtedly came to his ears, they are probably one of the reasons which caused him to become bitterly hostile to the Armenian race.

The moderate party amongst the Turks, reasonable men, even those, who wished the government to be conducted on the

old lines and to be reformed quietly upon such lines, never had a hearing from him. They soon learned to distrust him, and he on his part became surrounded either by sycophants, working to fill their own pockets, or by unscrupulous adventurers. He had begun by believing that he was surrounded by enemies, and he ended by a general distrust of everybody with whom he came in contact, and with the conviction that he alone knew how to govern the country. Gradually we learned that the chief weapon for his own defence was a system of espionage which, limited at first to men in office, was gradually extended to comprise almost everybody of note in the country.

His surroundings had never been favourable to manliness or to the development of the talents required by a successful ruler. In this he was subject to the same disabilities that for upwards of three centuries have always weighed upon heirs to the Turkish throne. They are largely the results of the Turkish law of succession. Instead of following the European rule, the Crown Prince as already mentioned is the eldest surviving male member belonging to the Imperial family. If one thinks for a moment of the European method we recognise at once how superior it is to the Turkish. King Edward VII., during many years before his mother's death, had taken over a great number of public functions which otherwise would have fallen to the sovereign. Besides attending one of the Houses of Parliament on important discussions, he had the advantage of meeting the great statesmen belonging to both sides of the House. The same remark applies to our present King. He has served in the Navy and has mixed with all classes of eminent men, politicians Liberal and Conservative, Ambassadors of other Powers, distinguished divines, judges and literary men. For education in kingcraft one could not devise a superior method.

The occupant of the throne in Turkey, and especially perhaps the mother of such occupant, desires that her son shall succeed. But in front of him there will probably stand half a dozen members of the family who are his

seniors. Fourteen such members ranked before the present Sultan Mahomet V. and the eldest son of the deposed Murad. A century and a half ago children of the Royal family who were likely to stand in the way of a succession were often murdered, and some of the most pathetic passages in Turkish history relate to the intrigues which took place either to kill the heir to the throne, or to prevent an infant attaining to that position. The reigning sovereign has usually regarded the Crown Prince with suspicion, and has prevented him becoming acquainted with the Ministers or having any but strictly formal communication with the representatives of foreign states.

It was under this system that Abdul Hamid had been brought up. He was never allowed to see foreign Ambassadors or to take any part in discussing the affairs of the empire. His youthful want of training and his limited environment give the key to his subsequent characteristics, unconsidered action, and above all, suspicion. When on the deposition of Murad, Abdul Hamid was girded with the sword of Osman, he was the nominee of the party which had brought about two revolutions. That party had great hopes in him and his pliability. They were soon undeceived. Every month saw an increase of the personal influence of the Sultan. After the failure of the Conference in January, 1877, England and Russia still endeavoured to make terms with him by which war would be prevented. He, however, was the great obstacle.

When during the war, on December 10, Plevna fell and the Russian troops poured across the Balkans, Abdul Hamid tried to prevent their advance by sending messengers to treat for peace and leaving them without any powers to treat. When this childish ruse failed he became alarmed for his personal safety and proposed to seek safety by flight to Brusa. Indeed it was only on the earnest protestations of Sir Henry Layard that he was persuaded not to flee, Sir Henry telling him that if he deserted his post he would never be allowed to return. On neither of these occasions did Abdul shew statesmanship.

From that time the Sultan turned his attention to removing from the capital all who had aided in placing him on the throne, with one exception. The exception was the Minister of Marine, who lived on and retained his office until his death in 1902. It was only towards the end of his life that I met with him, but he had the reputation of being a brave, bluff sailor who feared neither the Sultan nor anybody else. When he was reproached by Abdul for having pocketed £200,000 in one operation, he corrected his imperial master by saying that it was £300,000. None of us could understand why amidst the dismissal of so many Ministers, and of everybody connected with the deposition of his predecessors, Abdul Hamid did not get rid of the Minister of Marine. It was in vain that, in the long interval between 1876 and 1902, everyone knew that the fleet had been allowed to rot and rust, and that with one insignificant exception none of the really magnificent ironclads which the Sultan had found on his accession ever went out of the harbour of the Golden Horn.

Everyone saw that the naval school languished ; though torpedo boats and new ironclads had been bought. They knew that the Minister was currently reported to do nothing unless he were heavily bribed, but throughout these long years Abdul Hamid retained him at his post. His persistence led to a legend that the Minister held a document which the Sultan had signed at his accession and on the demand of the conspirators, to the effect that if the deposed Murad recovered, he, Abdul Hamid, would abdicate in his favour. Such document was alleged to have been sent to some place in Western Europe for safe keeping, with instructions that it should be published in case of the Minister's death by violence. Whether the story is true or not I cannot say, but, like the Father of History, I add " they say so."

I have already told the story of how Midhat was brought to Constantinople on the charge against him of having been a principal party in the murder of Abdul Aziz, and I have expressed my opinion, as did Sir Henry Elliot, Dr.

Dickson, with the other eighteen doctors who examined the body, that the case was one of suicide and not of murder. The verdict of the Turkish court, delivered in June, 1881, proves nothing. I followed the evidence day by day and my verdict would have been "Not guilty." Possibly a verdict of "Not proven" would have expressed more accurately the general opinion. Sir Henry Elliot wrote an article on the subject in the *Nineteenth Century*, in which he maintained that the evidence shewed the death to be by suicide, and characterised the action of Abdul Hamid as the blackest spot in the record of his reign.

An incident occurred to me in connection with this which is worth relating. Sir Henry Elliot's article had infuriated Abdul Hamid. Then, as always during his reign, he was keenly sensitive to what was said about him in influential Western publications. I wrote a long letter on the subject of the death of Abdul Aziz and on Sir Henry Elliot's article. The day after it was posted at the British post-office, Sir William White, then Ambassador, informed me as a matter of great urgency that the Sultan had learned that I had written on the subject to the *Daily News*, and Sir William intimated that in the then condition of negotiations between Great Britain and the Porte it was inopportune to say anything which would increase the irritation of the Sultan. I telegraphed to Sir John Robinson to withhold the letter until he heard from me. This he did, and concluded that on the whole it was better not to publish it. The question, however, puzzled Sir William White, and still more me, as to how the Sultan had learned that I had written. I was confident that no one could have seen my letter before it was posted, and I knew that I had not spoken to anyone about it. The mystery was not cleared up for some months, when it was found that the British postal-bag was regularly opened by Turkish spies between Constantinople and Bulgaria. Means were taken to prevent anything of the kind happening in future.

Several attempts, mostly of a very foolish kind, were made by adherents of the Midhat party to get rid of the

Sultan. Abdul Hamid succeeded in repressing all movements among the Turks in favour of reform and in getting rid of the would-be reformers. One of the most important of such movements was by Ali Suavi, and when he, with a few followers, attempted to create a new revolution at the palace, they were simply killed off and nothing was allowed to be said of the matter in the newspapers. The new Ministers were mostly subservient creatures who held office only so long as they were ready to acquiesce without discussion in the Sultan's wishes. The sub-Ministers were usually chosen because they were known to be hostile to the Ministers. The Sultan had, in fact, succeeded in his aim of making himself an absolute ruler, and when in the latter portion of his life Ministers are spoken of, it is well to remember that the real actor was Abdul Hamid himself. He had become jealous and distrustful of everyone who did not give him an uncompromising support. The late Arminius Vambery, in his singularly interesting biography, calls attention to this phase of Abdul Hamid's character. He points out that although both Sir Henry Elliot and Sir Henry Layard were sincerely disposed to befriend Turkey and its ruler, Abdul Hamid came to hate them and to consider them as amongst his worst enemies.

A further illustration of the same distrust of those disposed to befriend Turkey was furnished in the autumn of 1886, during the visit of Sir Henry Drummond Wolfe. Mr. Gladstone had always maintained that the British occupation of Egypt was not intended to be permanent, and had made various declarations to this effect in the House of Commons. He remained loyal to the conviction which was the central idea of England during the Crimean war, that it was in the interest of England to maintain the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire. It was a real disappointment to him that the Sultan would not accept the invitation to send troops to accompany our army into Egypt when Lord Dufferin had submitted an offer to that effect. The troops were wanted more as a symbol of Turkish authority than for any assistance they could render, and if the Sultan had

had half the shrewdness with which his flatterers credited him, he would gladly have accepted the invitation.

When the Conservatives came into power Lord Salisbury, between whom and Mr. Gladstone I suspect there was little difference of opinion on foreign affairs, renewed the declarations that our occupation of Egypt was only temporary, and, as a result, sent out Sir Henry Drummond Wolfe to arrange the conditions under which the evacuation should be accomplished. I saw Sir Henry every two or three days, and followed the work which he had in hand. He did it extremely well. He took Turkish delays and changes of attitude very coolly and yet succeeded after about two months in coming to an arrangement by which the last soldier was to leave Egypt within seven years after the confirmation of the arrangement, with the condition that in case reoccupation became necessary, British troops and not others should be called in to the aid of the Sultan. The arrangement was signed by Sir Drummond Wolfe and the Grand Vizier, *ne varietur*, and everybody in Constantinople thought that the business was practically finished. Of course Lord Salisbury accepted it at once on behalf of Her Majesty.

To the surprise of everybody Abdul Hamid refused to consent. I never heard any other reason given for such refusal except the desire of Abdul Hamid to administer a rebuff to England. As we were still in the period of pin-pricks, it is not improbable that he was led to believe by representatives of France and Russia that he could get better terms, and that he had made a bad bargain. If this were so these powers were not playing the game. But I am convinced that Turkish statesmen would see, in spite of such efforts if they were made, that the bargain, so far as their country was concerned, was pure gain, and that it was wise to agree that all our troops should be out of the country within seven years.

England accepted the Sultan's rebuff, and was not greatly concerned. We were in possession. About a year afterwards it dawned upon Abdul Hamid that he had blundered. He instructed his Ambassador in London to see Lord

Salisbury and ask for the reopening of negotiations. Lord Salisbury declared that he had no wish for further negotiations, and that after the refusal of the Wolfe Convention he had no proposals to make. The answer probably lost nothing of its abruptness in transmission, and greatly annoyed Abdul Hamid. The British Grand Vizier had forgotten that the request came from the Sultan. The Turkish Ambassador was ordered peremptorily to demand the reopening of the negotiations immediately. It was near the end of the Parliamentary session. Lord Salisbury replied that he was tired and moreover had made arrangements to go abroad, and the Egyptian question, which was not pressing, would perfectly well keep, and it had to keep.

The Egyptian question gave very little trouble for several years. The Wolfe Convention became a dead letter. But the period of pin-pricks between England and France regarding Egypt continued. During its continuance, however, France and Italy came to an arrangement in reference to Tunis, in 1896, when France annexed the country. It was then currently reported among diplomats that an understanding had been arrived at, substantially to the effect that France would make no further difficulties about our occupation of Egypt, and we should make none about Tunis.

The loss of his influence in Egypt was felt by the Sultan more perhaps than that of the countries he lost during the Turco-Russian war. Egypt was a Moslem country, whereas Bulgaria, Rumania, and the neighbourhood of Batoum were largely Christian. Abdul Hamid had a special representative in Egypt, Muktar Pasha, who regularly reported what the British were doing. The troubles with the Mahdi raised a hope in the Sultan's mind that the invaders had taken in hand more than they could accomplish; but later he recognised his mistake. Meantime every month of our occupation brought word of the wonderful material progress of Egypt. Public works which had been dreamed of were actually executed. The people were more lightly taxed than ever and yet the revenue increased. Justice was not

only to be had in the Courts of the Reform, as those which had been established were and are called, but the people were beginning to believe in such a possibility. An important emigration largely consisting of Moslems, mostly Druses, set in steadily from Syria to Egypt.

Sultan Abdul Hamid was, however, always endeavouring to encroach upon the English domination in Egypt, and in 1906 there occurred the Tabah incident. A railway had been constructed from Damascus parallel to the shores of the Red Sea, with the intention of taking it to the sacred cities Medina and Mecca.

This was a favourite project of Abdul Hamid, which was really taken in hand with his permission by Izzet Pasha, of whom something must be said. He was an Arab by origin, of marked ability and of great ambition. One of his colleagues, when he was judge in Macedonia, informed me many years ago that Izzet had told him that if he could get to Constantinople he would aim at getting into the palace, and felt confident not only that he could accomplish this, but that he would be able to exercise great influence over Abdul Hamid. When I first made his acquaintance he was First President of the Commercial Court, or Tidjaret, as it is called. I argued many cases before him and found him an able judge who could get to the point of an argument with unusual celerity.

At last his opportunity came. He was called to the palace, and for some years before the Revolution of July, 1908, was His Majesty's Chief Secretary. Indeed it was commonly said that the palace was run by two men, Izzet Pasha and Tachsin Bey. They could obtain the Sultan's consent to any concession or to any appointment to be made upon which they were agreed. I think that on the whole observers who knew what was going on in the palace recognised that Izzet's rule was beneficial. It was commonly reported that both he and his colleague were in the pay of the Germans. But as to this I would remark in fairness that report would have said the same about any men in their positions, and that while it was notorious that for the

purposes of the Bagdad Railway and for other concessions the Germans paid heavily, I am not in a position to point out who the individuals were who received cash.

When the two Secretaries did not agree upon a project submitted to them, it usually fell through, because each was powerful enough to prevent the success of the other. A case which created considerable interest regarded the appointment of a Grand Vizier. Izzet proposed one man, his colleague another. Neither would give way. They finally agreed to recommend Ferid, then the Vali or Governor of Konia, under the belief that when the time came they could get rid of him and appoint someone in his place. This plan was carried out. A Greek by race, but a Moslem, Raghib, who had made a fortune by acting as adviser to His Majesty, when he heard of the probability of the appointment of Ferid is reported to have written to his imperial master strongly dissuading him from making it and declaring that if Ferid were made Grand Vizier, within a year the new premier would have acquired the friendship of every ambassador in the place, and His Majesty would be unable to get rid of him. Nevertheless Ferid was appointed. The new Grand Vizier, who had proved his capacity as a Governor while at Konia, shewed a like capacity in Constantinople, and continued in his office until the Revolution of July, 1908, during which he so conducted himself as not to lose the confidence either of the Sultan or of the committee of Union and Progress.

It is not necessary to believe all the stories told of Izzet, but one is at least amusing. The Sultan, after the manner of his predecessors, always had an astrologer. As to astrologers, let me interject that there is a very curious account given in *The Life of Sir Thomas Roe*, English Ambassador in the seventeenth century, of the demand made upon him by the Sultan to send him English books on astrology. He explains in his dispatch that the Turks are convinced that the prosperity of the Western countries of Europe is due largely to their knowledge of that subject. It was in vain that Sir Thomas had told them that English

people did not believe in astrology. He saw from the way in which his remarks were received that they believed he was merely manœuvring to keep them out of the knowledge that his countrymen possessed, and therefore asked that all the books they could find on the subject should be gathered up and sent to him.

The repute of these astrologers is still great in Turkey. Both men and women practise the art. The reading of the stars, supported by the indications of the marks on the hands, and of incidents in a person's life, are believed always if rightly interpreted to give sure predictions. But the palace astrologer has usually held a highly trusted position. The one who occupied the post when the Revolution of 1908 came about was reported to be on the most intimate terms with Izzet, and the story was current that the latter received telegrams daily of all important events happening in the Empire. Whether, as the report added, these were privately shewn to the astrologer and predictions made in accordance therewith, the telegrams being retained until the next day, is more than I can vouch for.

When Izzet saw that his imperial master attached great importance to a railway to convey pilgrims to the sacred cities, he joined heartily in the project. I doubt whether anybody ever considered him a particularly good Moslem, but he was a Syrian, and appears to have worked cordially at the project of making the Hedjaz Railway, which would at least benefit the Syrians.

In 1906 the railway was used as a means of annoyance to England in Egypt. A small body of Turkish troops was sent down south from Damascus, and occupied the small village of Tabah on the western side of the Gulf of Akaba, one of the two which form a fork at the northern end of the Red Sea. The village is on Egyptian territory, and south of the boundary line between Turkey and Egypt, which runs from Akaba to Rafia, a point a little to the north of El Arish on the Mediterranean. Tabah was so evidently on Egyptian territory that the British Government was confident that its occupation was a simple blunder, and that the Turks would

clear out as soon as they had time to examine the position.

Up to the time of these negotiations they had never officially recognised that we were in occupation of Egypt and had the right to act for her. Three months passed in negotiations. Sir Nicholas O'Connor was wonderfully patient. But it was only on the assembly of our Mediterranean Fleet at the Piræus that Abdul Hamid consented to yield to what his own Ministers recognised as a just claim. Sir Nicholas acted with caution and vigour. In May the British Government gave the Turks ten days' notice to evacuate Tabah, and to appoint a commission of Egyptians and Turks to draw the boundary line between the points already mentioned. Finally, ten hours after the time which had been given in which to clear out, Abdul Hamid acceded to all the British demands. It was the first occasion on which England's right to act for Egypt was officially recognised by Turkey. Sir Nicholas had scored a diplomatic victory.

Abdul Hamid's reign continued to be one long attempt to make himself absolute. I cannot accept the statement which has often been made, that he was a man of statesman-like mind. He had no sense of proportion. Small matters to him were as important as big ones. The delay of ten hours in quitting Egyptian territory he regarded as a triumph. From the earliest period of his reign to his last years as Sultan this characteristic pettiness marked him. Sir Henry Layard told me the story of his going one morning to the palace in the early part of his career as Ambassador, while yet a great favourite there, and, finding the Sultan looking wearied and worn out, Sir Henry remarked to him that he seemed tired. "Yes," said His Majesty, "I am very tired." As at that time there was no important political question under consideration, Sir Henry asked, in reply to the statement that he had been occupied for some hours with the papers before him, to what they related. The answer was that they were the *règlement* or regulations of the Cafés Chantantes at Pera. "But," said Layard, "in England neither the Sovereign nor any of his Ministers would trouble themselves with a personal examination of such a document.

It would be left to responsible clerks." The Sultan's reply was that he had nobody that he could trust. This sentiment gives the key to much of his conduct. He trusted nobody, was suspicious of everybody. He believed that everybody had his price, and that he was sufficiently clever to appreciate their price, and obtain the results which he desired.

Every year he became more suspicious. His belief that no one ought to be trusted but that all men could be bought marked his dealings with the Press. There was not a newspaper in Constantinople during the period before the Revolution of 1908 that was not subsidised by the State. There was a censorate to examine everything that went into the newspapers. If a newspaper offended, it was either suspended for a given term or suppressed altogether. The system was an absurd one, because sometimes it was convenient to be suspended, and newspapers occasionally inserted an article for which they knew they would be able to obtain a holiday of a few days or weeks. If they really wished to say something which would offend the Government and yet did not wish to be suppressed, the article would be inserted, the paper suspended or suppressed, and then the proprietor would produce the same newspaper under another name, which everybody recognised as the continuation of the one suspended.

The *Levant Herald* on various occasions was suppressed and came out as the *Eastern Express*. On one occasion Mr. Whittaker, the editor and proprietor, during a period of suppression produced his *Epistle to the Galatians*, for which he claimed that he did not require any Government permission. He often led the censor and the Government a fine dance with his paper. He would print three lines and leave a blank column with a statement that on the subject at the head of the chapter he had written fully, but as it had been suppressed he left the space.

Nothing was allowed to be reproduced from a paper published outside Turkey, unless it had been approved by the censor. The tales that were told as to the tricks played upon the Sultan with reference to foreign papers are legion.

A man in France would get set up in type an article either abusing the Sultan personally or pointing out the folly of Turkish foreign policy. It would be sent to some friend in Turkey to present at the Press Department, or sometimes even to some of the Ministers, with the notification that it was the proof which was going to appear in a paper and which the sender had managed to intercept on condition that a large sum, sometimes alleged to be as high as £500, were sent to the writer. That a good deal of blackmail was thus levied I have no doubt. All sorts of silly articles in defence of Abdul Hamid personally and of the policy of the Government appeared in French, German, and Austrian newspapers, which were evidently paid for or sent in hopes of being paid for.

The sensitiveness of Abdul Hamid to the public expression of opinion can only be ascribed to ~~sheer ignorance~~. There was little discrimination between the value of newspapers. An article in the *Muddleton Gazette* seemed to him to be as important as one in the *Times*. There were notoriously men in Constantinople levying blackmail upon the Government through their connection with small foreign newspapers. In many instances such was the corruption that I believe the officials shared in the sums obtained for the prevention of articles being inserted, or for the publication of quite valueless articles in foreign papers. The foreign Press was carefully watched by two sets of censors, one at the palace, the other at the Sublime Porte. Every item relating to His Majesty or to Turkey was carefully noted, extracts made, and then the day's reports from the two sets of censors were compared. If either had missed an item an enquiry would probably lead to a reprimand or the punishment of the offender.

I claim for myself that I constantly exposed abuses, commented freely on the conduct of Turkish statesmen, and had my say on the government of the country. I learnt at an early date that the *Daily News*, in which most of my letters appeared, headed the official black list. I knew several of the censors who regarded me as incorrigible. On

different occasions one or other of them told me of passages which, much against their will, they had to bring to the notice of the Sultan. Very often their communication would be made with the remark, "Of course what you say is true, but if I don't report it and it should be reported by one of the staff of the other set of censors I shall lose my place."

I can honestly say that I was very little troubled by the censors. Once, and only once, I was slightly alarmed. It was in my early days at Constantinople, during the time of the exposure of the Moslem outrages in Bulgaria. A member of the Council whom I knew slightly came to inform me privately that the Government had determined to expel me, on account of my letters to the *Daily News*, and that I should receive an official visit to such effect. At that time it did not suit my convenience to be expelled, but I had already learnt that in dealing with Easterns truthfulness and a bold face were the best attitude to shew.

When, therefore, the official visit was paid, I had made up my mind what to do. He professed great respect for me and declared that the resolution to expel me would have been carried, but that he had persuaded the Council to allow the matter to stand over until he had seen me and obtained a promise that I would not again write anything against the Government. I took him up when he concluded by saying that he came as a friend, and replied, "If you are my friend, get me expelled." He expressed his astonishment. "But why?" "I will tell you why. I am now addressing tens of thousands of people through the *Daily News*. If you expel me I shall be in Parliament within six weeks, and will then address the whole world." He returned, gave his report, and I never heard anything more about being expelled.

Occasionally it happened that a newspaper proprietor sold himself to the devil. It is only right to say that, speaking generally, such proprietors, who were mostly also editors, preserved a fairly good conscience. In Australia it used to be said that no man with a soul to be saved ought to be a bullock-driver. I have often used the expression

with regard to editors in Turkey ; and it is to their credit that they have managed to exist and yet not write what they knew to be false. There was a notorious case some twelve years ago of a scoundrel who in his journal praised Abdul Hamid and the Ministers in power to an unlimited extent. In return he levied blackmail upon the leading members of both the Turkish and the foreign communities. He did not hesitate to go round himself or send an employé who, without going about his business in roundabout fashion, would bluntly say that the paper in question was going to attack the person addressed unless he received a good sum of money. Many persons gave way rather than see themselves accused as robbers, as sons of the gutter, or as having been mixed up in some shady business connected with a woman. The man was quite notoriously making a living by blackmailing, but it was equally notorious that he was protected by the minions of the Sultan, and that legal proceedings against him would be useless. He was generally loathed but also dreaded. At length he went a step too far and blundered.

In league with a creature of his own kind who had access to the blank forms of decoration, he decorated various persons. In order that the recipient might have evidence he inserted a statement of the fact in his newspaper, of which he printed only three or four copies containing it, which he gave to the recipient. Some of the persons so honoured were Austrian subjects of a low grade, who for their own glorification republished the statement in local Austrian papers. The Balplatz called the attention of Baron Calice, the Austrian Ambassador, to these local publications, and he, nothing doubting of their veracity, pointed out to the Minister of Foreign Affairs that the giving of such decorations to such *canaille* was a blunder. Enquiry was made and discovery followed ; the dossier was full of charges against the offending editor, and as the whole city was laughing at Turkish decorations in consequence, he was arrested and thrown into the common Turkish prison. The satisfaction was general when it was announced on the

following day in the papers that amongst his fellow prisoners there were several of his victims, and that they fell upon and nearly killed him.

Abdul Hamid was essentially a vain man, and many of the stories told about him turn upon this characteristic. He was fond of boasting to his associates of his influence over men. One of such stories represents him as declaring to one of his intimates that he could move anyone to tears. "Watch," said he, pointing to a man who was approaching, "watch this effendi." The Sultan entered at once into a conversation with the new-comer and after a few minutes the third person saw that he was weeping. Thereupon the Sultan turned to him and said, "Did I not say I could do it?"

I have denied to Abdul Hamid the possession of any gift of statesmanship, but he was smart in repartee, and the following illustration is to the credit of Abdul Hamid's powers in that line. An American Minister,* after dining with His Majesty, accompanied him to a bijou theatre which had been built in the grounds of Yildiz. The lower portion was carefully covered with tapestry and brocades. The Sultan was in a small gallery, of course in the most prominent position. On his right was the Minister in a box separated only by a rail from that of His Majesty. The Minister had with him his First Dragoman.

In the interval between the acts the Sultan lit a cigarette and passed his box to the Minister. Then His Majesty asked, "How do you like our Turkish tobacco?" Now I must mention here that the Minister in question had the inconvenient habit of spitting on all occasions and everywhere, and as he lit his cigarette spat over the edge of the box upon the brocades. The Sultan winced. The Minister replied that he liked Turkish tobacco very well, but trusted that His Majesty had liked the Virginia tobacco of which he had brought him a specimen. "Yes," said His Majesty, "it

* At the time of the story the U.S.A. were not yet represented by an Ambassador.

is very good, but I keep it for smoking in the garden, where I can spit."

The interview ended, but the reply of the Sultan rankled in the Minister's mind, and two days later he asked the Dragoman whether he remembered the observation and whether he thought that the Sultan applied it to him. The answer was, "Why, of course; there was nobody else there who spat." The only survivor at the present moment is the Sultan himself, so there is no harm in telling the story.

CHAPTER X

ARMINIUS VAMBERY AND ABDUL HAMID

Père Hyacinthe—Women without Souls—The Khedive's Dictum—"Free Speech" in Turkey—The Sultan's Interference—Sir Henry Bulwer and Plataea—His Dummy Library—Arminius Vambery—A Chance Encounter—A Polyglot Gentleman—Vambery's Advice to Abdul Hamid—The Sultan's Anger—A Suppressed Book—The White Slave Traffic—A Courageous Englishwoman—An American's Mistake—A Splendid Work.

I HAD an interesting visit from Monsieur Loyson, better known to the British public as Père Hyacinthe, a man who had a European reputation fifty years ago. As a distinguished preacher he had attracted great crowds to hear him in Notre Dame at Paris. He was, however, of the modernist school, and left the Church of Rome. He was well received by a select intellectual circle in England, of which perhaps Dean Stanley was the chief. He informed me, amongst other things, that Archbishop Tait had suggested to him that he should enter the English Church. But this he declined to do.

In Alexandria, before he came to Constantinople, he had given lectures to great crowds in the Opera House. The ladies of the Khedive's harem attended some of them, and when he declared that the great *tache* upon the Moslem faith was the position it assigned to women, general applause followed. Immediately afterwards there was a series of *applaudissements* from the boxes where the Moslem ladies were seated behind lattice-work, so distinct that it sent a ripple of laughter throughout the house. Recounting the

circumstance to me, he asked what was in my opinion the cause of the low estimate which Moslems formed of women. My reply was that in popular estimation women had no souls. The Père almost jumped out of his seat with astonishment. I repeated my words "in popular estimation," calling attention to the fact that there were three or four passages in the Koran which implied that women had souls, but maintaining that my statement was correct. I have still no reason to doubt it. While admitting my right to speak on the subject with a certain authority, he requested me to send him any independent statement if I met with such. Less than a year afterwards I met with *Shifting Scenes*, and there found a statement which confirmed what I had said. Sir Edward Malet had remonstrated with the Khedive for allowing himself to be seen within easy gun-shot of the rebels. In reply the Khedive remarked, "Death does not signify to me personally. Our religion prevents us from having any fear of death. But it is different with our women. To them, you know, life is everything. Their existence ends here. They cry and weep and implore me to save them."

Père Hyacinthe had come to Constantinople on a self-imposed mission. He recognised that in the teaching of Judaism, especially when it is of so noble a character as set out in the Prophet Micah, where the Lord requires of man "To do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before God," there was a divine element. The same element he discovered also in Islam, which is the doctrine of resignation to the Divine will, and his idea was to effect some kind of union between the three great faiths. Each one was to keep his own, but to recognise a kindred teaching which was to be found in the other two. To hear him explain his idea was to be carried away by his eloquence, not only of word but of thought. He proposed to give two or three "conferences" or lectures upon the subject. But certain persons interfered, believed by him to be of the Jesuit order in Constantinople, and when persons went to the hall where the lecture was announced for delivery, a hall belonging to an American institution, they found police officers on the watch. If visitors

were Turkish subjects they were turned back. Foreigners were invited not to enter, but were not refused admittance if they persisted. I went in, but it was on the whole wisely decided that nothing should be done which should bring about a conflict with the police. I do not know whether the Jesuits took any part in preventing the lecture being delivered. It was at a time when Abdul Hamid was so imbued with suspicion that he was unwilling to permit any public meeting which could be prevented.

The attempts which Abdul made to prevent meetings of foreigners, even in private houses, were many and persistent. If the occupant were the subject of a State represented by an Ambassador who was complaisant, he would send his agents to him to request the Ambassador to persuade or order the subject not to give the dinner-party or allow the dance which had been arranged for. Usually he succeeded. One characteristic story of such an attempt, though it belongs to a later period than that of which I am treating, is worth placing upon record. In the village of Kadikewi, the ancient Chalcedon, a mile and a half distant from Constantinople, there was a prosperous British community. They ran their own institute, built themselves a church, and paid the chaplain. So good a character did the community bear, that brave old Bishop Sandford spoke of it in almost the last year of his life as the model parish of his diocese. At that time their chaplain was Mr. (now Canon) Whitehouse, who is now Embassy Chaplain. He had a great gift in getting up private theatricals at Christmas for children.

For several years in succession it was a delight to see the institute at Kadikewi converted into a theatre, all the performers being boys and girls of the British community, or schoolfellows. Their dancing and their exhibition of calisthenic were always charming, and were attended by others as well as by practically every member of the British community. To suppose that they had any political signification would be as absurd as to suggest that at private theatricals at an English country house, where

only English people were present, a plot was being hatched against the Chinese Government. However, on one such occasion two men appeared at the British Embassy with a request to see Sir Nicholas O'Connor. They were admitted and declared that they came from His Majesty. They had been charged to request that he should give orders to put an end to this performance, which was immoral and indecent.

Sir Nicholas had arranged to take his charming daughters there that very afternoon, and of course knew all concerned with getting up the entertainment and a large portion of the audience. The suggestion aroused his Irish blood, and he bluntly told the messengers that he did not believe that they came from the Sultan, refused to make any promise of the kind, and sent them away with a reprimand for daring to come to the Embassy with such an absurd story as that they had come from His Majesty. Thereupon, as he told me the story himself, he immediately sent round and invited all the children belonging to the other Embassies to accompany him in his large steam-launch to the entertainment that afternoon. Thither he went, and nothing more was heard from the Sultan.

It must be about thirty years since I first met the distinguished oriental traveller Armenius Vambery. I had heard much of what he had done and of the many friends he possessed with the Turks, and especially of the influence which he was at that time believed to have with the Sultan. We had each been invited to a picnic on a lonely island in the Marmara, distant about twelve miles from Constantinople, and known by the Greeks as *Plataea* or Flat Island, to distinguish it from another less than a mile distant, *Oxaea* or Pointed Island. *Plataea* is, however, known to Englishmen as Bulwer's Island. It was so called after Sir Henry Bulwer, who succeeded Lord Stratford de Redcliffe. He certainly does not rank amongst England's successful Ambassadors. He was there at a time when Ismail, Khedive of Egypt, was intriguing to have the law of succession to the Khedival

throne altered. Ismail squandered money recklessly to accomplish his purpose.

During this time Bulwer, who was undoubtedly a faddy man, chose to purchase the island of Platæa, and built a residence upon it which contained reminiscences of his brother's residence at Knebworth. For example, there was a room called the library, full of dummy books. I remember seeing the back of one, *Cursory Remarks on Swearing*. Another was "*Lambs' Tails*." "*Percy Vere*," in ten volumes. The situation was delightful for a recluse who might have half a dozen visitors, but it was open to the objection that it could not be approached except in fine weather, and that there was neither a beach nor a harbour for anything but a small boat. It was generally stated that he spent £16,000 on the purchase of the island and the construction of the building. The sum appears to me to be a reasonable estimate. Unfortunately, while negotiations were going on for the change of succession, he is believed to have sold the island and all it contained for £70,000. Of course in a country like Turkey such a transaction was immediately regarded as a bribe, and the story current was that when his successor, Lord Lyons, was appointed to Constantinople, Lord Palmerston, in saying good-bye, hoped he would not be wrecked on any island in the Marmara. *Se non e vero*, etc.

Amid many pleasant picnics that I have enjoyed on Bulwer's Island none was more delightful than that mentioned, given, if my memory serves, by Sir John Pender. Vambery, Mr. Morgan Foster, and a number of Englishmen and ladies were present. The castle was already falling to ruins. There was only one man, a caretaker, usually living upon the island, for though Ismail had bought it the island was quite useless to him. From the date of that picnic until the first year of the reign of Edward VII. Vambery and I had lost sight of each other. Lunching, however, in the station at Cologne I saw an elderly man of Jewish appearance, who came up and said, "You and I have met, but I can't recall where." I have no doubt that I looked

dirty, because I had been travelling all night in a train without a sleeping car. I am quite sure that he did, and I was therefore not anxious to make his acquaintance. I told him that I thought that he was mistaken. "No," said he, "I am sure we have met." He then asked, "Are you a member of the Athenæum?" I replied in the negative, but said that I belonged to the Reform. "No," said he, "I have not met you there," but put his hand to his mouth and said, "I am Armenius Vambéry."

I then recalled the last time we had met, and the appearance of his companion, who was a Hungarian bishop. He remembered the incident more distinctly than did I, and we then arranged to travel together as far as Brussels. We had a long conversation together about Turkey. He told me he was on the way to see Edward VII., and I confess I was doubtful as to his veracity. However, after our long conversation during the ride to Brussels I doubted no longer, and I learnt from the *Times* after a few days that he had had a long audience with the late King. He occupied until his death a somewhat unique position. He had the misfortune to be taken up by the extreme anti-Russian members of the Conservative Party. They made much of him whenever he went to London, and in consequence he was looked upon with suspicion by Liberals generally, and was classified with the ordinary jingos. I had long since found out that he was essentially a moderate man, eager after facts, and employing his wonderful linguistic abilities to obtain them wherever possible.

In his early days in Constantinople, when, as now, numbers of Moslem pilgrims passed through Turkey on their way to the holy cities, he would get hold of the most intelligent and learn the news from Bokhara, Khiva, Samarcand, and other places further east. I had had occasion two or three times to test the value of the information he sent. Baker Pasha made a somewhat remarkable excursion into Central Asia, and in conversation with Vambéry checked him in reference to the situation of a house in a far eastern city which Vambéry had also visited as a pilgrim; and Baker told me that

his knowledge of details in reference to the geography of the places that he had visited was exceptionally correct. Then, too, one of the famous correspondents of the *Daily News*, O'Donovan, had also made the acquaintance of Vambery, and bore witness to the accuracy of his statements. He informed me on this journey to Brussels that he had refused offers from our Foreign Office to make regular reports on the situation in Central Asia, preferring to keep his independence. At the same time, however, he sent reports from time to time for which the Government paid a fair remuneration.

For a man who by his opponents had been described as a spy, I never met one who left a more favourable impression upon me. That impression was confirmed by reading his autobiography, which is full of delightful human touches shewing how the little ragged Jew boy commenced his career in Hungary and worked his way up until he had become, as he was when I last saw him, President of the Academy of Buda-Pesth.

Perhaps the most interesting part of our conversation related to his dealings with Abdul Hamid. For years after I had first met him I knew that he regularly communicated reports to the palace. When the Sultan received him he always spoke of him as Baba, or Father. It became, however, evident that Vambery was not inclined to be either a spy or a flatterer of the Sultan. He had a genuine liking for the Turk, and he soon decided that Abdul Hamid was doing great injury to the Turkish race, and, as he put it, "dragging the country to ruin." Somewhat to my surprise, I had learned in Constantinople that this man, whom we were disposed to think had sold himself to the Sultan, had written a letter to him pointing out the injury that he was doing, and suggesting methods of reform. The letter was so emphatic in condemnation of Hamidean methods that the salary which he had been receiving was stopped. I asked Vambery if the statement were true, and he gave me full details. The letter which had decided His Majesty to stop his pay was the latest of a series in which he had pointed out the necessity of making essential reforms. But in this latest letter he had

told the Sultan in so many words that the spirit which constituted the Turkish nation was fast quitting all sections of the Turkish public, and that Abdul Hamid was the cause of its decadence.

On the same journey he cleared up a small personal matter which I may be permitted to mention. I had already been many years at work collecting material for and writing my *Destruction of the Greek Empire*. The justification for rewriting one of the most brilliant chapters in Gibbon was that since his time a mass of new material had come to light. All the Christian writers who were eye-witnesses of the capture of the city either belonged to the Church of Rome or at a later period joined it. No writer belonging to the Orthodox Church had left an account of the siege and the events preceding and following it; but, about forty years ago, there had been discovered in the Imperial Library in Stambul a Greek MS written by a subordinate secretary named Critobolus in the employ of Mahomet II., the conqueror of Constantinople.

I had become acquainted with several other works unknown to Gibbon, one of which, the diary of an Italian doctor who was present at the siege, was not published until, I believe, 1854. But the most important of such documents was undoubtedly the Life of Mahomet by Critobolus, which first became known through the labours of Dr. Dethier, an entirely honest man, but somewhat of a crank. For example, I have various tracts by him criticising pieces of sculpture and inscriptions with a scholar's zest, but mixed with them are denunciations of the frauds usually committed by priests of all kinds. When the MS was found, a copy was made either by or for Karl Müller, and published in Paris. But Dethier complained that the transcript was incorrect, and made one himself and added notes, some of which were of great value.

While working at my book, I was anxious to see the version of Dr. Dethier. The MS had been presented to the Imperial and Royal Academy at Buda-Pesth, and Dethier published a transcript of it in two volumes, with a translation

and notes. I saw one portion of this in proof as early as 1876. It belonged to Dr. Dethier himself, and remained with me only one evening. I knew that the whole had been printed, but when, many years afterwards, I wrote to the leading booksellers in Buda-Pesth and Vienna, I was informed that no such book existed. Really what had happened was the following : after Dethier's transcript was finished the Hungarians suddenly awoke to the fact that they were the brethren of the Turks, and a deputation of two hundred of them was sent to Constantinople in order to demonstrate their relationship to and friendship with the Turks. They were received with great delight by their hosts, and returned well pleased with what they regarded as the political results of their mission.

Then it occurred to some of them that the book which was in their possession and printed was not complimentary to Mahomet II. and the Turks who took part in the siege, and they accordingly committed the folly of suppressing the edition. I was professionally engaged for a fortnight in Vienna and Buda-Pesth, and employed my spare time in trying to get hold of a copy of this edition. I did not believe that they would actually have destroyed the volumes, and though my search in the libraries of the two cities was fruitless, yet on my visit to the Academy in Buda-Pesth the secretary produced a translation of the volume in Magyar, bursting into laughter when he saw that of course I could not read a word of it. He insisted that the edition had been destroyed, and for the moment I had to be content.

Some months afterwards a Hungarian colleague called upon me, stating that he was leaving the next day for Buda-Pesth, and asked if he could do anything for me. I at once replied that he could, and told him the tale narrated above. He took notes and said, " If it exists in Buda-Pesth I shall bring it back for you." I thought little more of the matter until two or three months later, when he entered my chambers, produced the two volumes that I desired, with a curious inscription in them, stating that he had received them with a condition that they should be given to the

historian, Monsieur E. Pears. I was delighted to obtain the volumes, and though the inscription struck me as curious, made no further enquiry about it.

Now I go back to my railway journey between Cologne and Brussels, in the course of which Vambéry asked, "Did — give you the volume of Critobolus?" I replied in the affirmative, but did not see why he asked such a question. He then explained to me that the application was made to him as President of the Buda-Pesth Academy, and that he and his colleagues had repeatedly refused similar requests on the ground that the transcript or the translation was not accurate, and that they would have continued to refuse, when — pleaded very hard, stating that he wanted the volumes for a friend and colleague in Constantinople. Then said Vambéry, "When I learned from him that it was for you they were wanted, I immediately took steps to let you have them, insisting, however, that he should write in our presence that they were not intended for him, but for you."

Great efforts had been made in Constantinople to suppress what is conveniently called the White Slave traffic. Prostitution is not a pleasant subject to write about, but unfortunately it exists in rather a worse form in the Near East than in Western countries. The Austrians are the only people who have licensed houses for the purpose in Turkey, and I have constantly heard stories of women who have been kept prisoners in such houses. Their dresses are furnished by the proprietress, to whom, in addition to having to pay a fixed proportion of their earnings, they have also to pay for such dresses in instalments. The general belief is probably well founded, that the accounts between the women and the proprietress shew the first to be constantly in debt. I have heard many such stories from friends in the consulates of various nations, including our own. The majority of the unfortunates are Jewesses, and most of them from Rumania.

Let me tell the story of one girl whom I had a hand in

saving. An energetic English lady, the wife of an English clergyman, came to ask my assistance under these circumstances: she had instituted an orphanage for girls during the Russo-Turkish war; the late Lady Strangford and a number of us British residents had assisted her, and we had seen that after ten years of work little girls of various races left orphans by the war had been taken in by her, fed, clothed, and had received an excellent education. She was, apparently, delicate in health, but in reality of great physical and intellectual activity and full of human sympathy. We all believed in her sincerity and single-mindedness.

She came to me in great distress and told the following story. Among the girls that had been in her orphanage for six years was the daughter of a Rumanian Jew. He made no secret of his purpose, but simply stated that he had sold the girl to a man who was collecting girls for the Far East, and that he was taking her away. There was no question as to the purpose for which she was being sold. She was good looking, and, added the lady, "She shall not go. She is a good, pious girl." She told me that she had been to the local police, who said that they could not interfere with a father's rights. They knew what the man was in Constantinople for, and could give no help. Then she went to the chief layman of the Jewish community. I knew him also well. He was an honest, honourable man, and indeed very charitable with his money. He threw up his hands and said, "It is very terrible, but how can it be helped?" He could render no assistance. Then she went to a Consul whom I knew well. His reply was also that as the girl was under Turkish jurisdiction he could not interfere. The poor woman burst into tears and said she would not allow this girl to be taken by her father. I sympathised entirely with her, and, to cut the story short, several of us found a means of smuggling her out of the country, and the last that I heard of her was that she was a very successful teacher in a free little country in Western Europe.

This story reminds me of the curious mistakes that passing

travellers constantly fall into on a hasty journey through Turkey and the East. A neighbour of mine was an American with a warm heart and a genuine vein of humour. He had a visitor from the United States who passed an evening with him. The American had nearly finished a book regarding his travels in the Near East. One chapter in particular he insisted upon reading. He was himself a clergyman or minister, though I do not know to what Church he belonged. The chapter was on the special glories of the Jewish race. He had seen them in Egypt, in Syria, in Russia, and elsewhere, and their great glory was that Heaven had always preserved the virginal purity of these daughters of Zion. My friend recognised the real eloquence of the chapter, but determined that he would give his friend a lesson in the facts. On the following day they went to the city and took their course along two or three streets where they were invited by half-naked women, in almost every European language, to enter. "But," said the American, "this is a dreadful sight. Who may these women be?" "Every one," said my friend, "is a daughter of Zion."

It is right that I should add that the Jewesses of England were the first to take steps to put an end to the hideous traffic of which I have spoken. A local committee was formed, of which I was a member, and was largely supplied with the necessary funds by a well-known English lady of the Jewish persuasion. We had an officer of the Girls' Protection Society who bore his description on his cap. He met every train that came in and every ship likely to have women passengers on board, furnished girls and young women whom he met with a circular letter, written in four or five different languages, warning them against going to any house the character of which they did not know, and giving a list of persons who would be ready at all times to give trustworthy information.

In addition a home was provided for them under the management of a lady who could make herself understood in three or four languages. The result was that the White Slave traffic was greatly diminished, and when a further effort was made

in 1913 in the same direction, by the formation of a committee of which the President was Mr. Morgenthau, the American Ambassador, the Government consented to give every aid possible to the Society, and gave such aid.

CHAPTER XI

THE SULTAN'S SUMMONS

Sir Edward Thornton—Mr. Sunset Cox—A Brilliant Speaker—Sir William White—His Friendship with Dr. Washburn—The Sultan Sends for Me—The Ideal Dragoman—I Refuse a Decoration—Haji Ali's Astonishment—The Sultan Persists—The Secretary's Ignorance—A Visit from a Spy—The Decoration Again Offered—A Significant Hint—The Value of a Turkish Decoration—The Order of the Mejidieh Conferred on a Fighting Cock.

LORD DUFFERIN ceased to be Ambassador on September 17, his place being filled by Mr. G. H. Wyndham, *Chargé d'Affaires*. Abdul Hamid by that time had made his peace with our Ambassador, but there must have been several sharp passages between them after the tussle that had taken place on England's invitation for the Turks to enter Egypt. I remember Lord Dufferin telling me, for example, that he had information that great numbers of Arabic documents had either been printed in the palace or taken there with the object of sending them by secret agents into Afghanistan and various places in India, urging revolt against British rule. Lord Dufferin had spoken to the Sultan on the subject, had informed him that he had full knowledge of what was being done, and pointed out that any action of that kind would lead to a misunderstanding between the two Powers. The Sultan professed ignorance but would enquire into the matter, and as a matter of fact most of the documents in question were destroyed.

Lord Dufferin's successor was Sir Edward Thornton. His appointment dated from December, 1884. He came to Turkey from Washington, where he had done excellent work,

and perhaps had the misfortune to bring too high a reputation. However, during his short term in Constantinople there was no burning question between the two countries, and he did well. The only personal incident that I can recall in reference to him is the following. He had an aversion to public speaking. Every year in Robert College there was a "Commencement Day," to me, as an Englishman, always a misnomer, in which degrees were conferred and speeches made. Our Ambassadors have been present usually at "Commencements." The most important speaker on that day was the American Minister (for at that time the United States had a Legation and not an Embassy), a gentleman usually known as Mr. Sunset Cox, a man of charming manner, wonderful facility of speech, a clear-headed man and a general favourite.

He had listened to various short orations in Greek, Armenian, Bulgarian, and Turkish, of none of which languages, as he frankly told us, he understood a word. But he made these orations the text for a rattling good speech which kept the crowded audience in a roar of laughter. He declared that now he believed more firmly than ever in the story of the confusion of tongues at the building of the Tower of Babel. He became enthusiastic on the union of nations and the glorification of the flag of the United States. A huge one hung on his left and an equally huge Union Jack on his right. But it happened that while he was speaking of the glories of the United States, he was constantly pointing to the Union Jack.

I think Sir Edward Thornton, who no doubt could have made a plain British statement of fact as well as most of us, got alarmed at having to follow so brilliant a speaker, and as I sat near him on the platform he begged me to reply on behalf of the British colony instead of him. This I did by trying to strike into the same vein of hilarity which Mr. Sunset Cox had employed. I remarked that no doubt the audience had observed that in speaking of the glories of the Stars and Stripes he had constantly pointed to the Union Jack, perhaps even more often than to his own flag. The

audience laughed, because what he had done had been seen by everybody. I declared that I had tried to think what was Mr. Cox's meaning. I pointed out that he was a diplomatist, and, addressing a college audience, saw that everybody would recognise that *diplo* was the same word as our double, and that in all the glorifications of the American flag he was thinking of, as well as pointing to, the British. The audience took my small point very well and I managed to say the right things. When I sat down Sir Edward stood up to take my hand and to tell me that I had done splendidly.

I went home that evening to Prinkipo with Mr. Cox in his steam-launch, and the conversation naturally turned upon public speaking. I stated that though I had heard many of our best English speakers, I had never met one who was more ready to make a point than was he. His answer was, that if I had had to stump for six weeks at a time and make speeches half a dozen times a day with all sorts of interruptions and being heckled everywhere, I would recognise how every American of experience became a ready speaker. When his term as Minister expired he wrote a book called *The Pleasures of Prinkipo*, and sent me a copy with a charming letter written from the presidential chair of the United States Senate. Few men have left pleasanter recollections in Constantinople than Mr. Sunset Cox.

At Sir Edward Thornton's departure from Constantinople Sir William A. White was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary *ad interim*, the appointment dating from April 18, 1885. I had not only seen Sir William when he came to Constantinople in 1876, but had visited him in Bucarest, where he had been appointed Minister on the establishment of the kingdom of Rumania. Sir William was a man who had risen entirely by his own merit. Before being appointed to Bucarest he was our Consul at Belgrade, and already when he came to Constantinople, on his first visit, seemed to know the inner working of the Government of Serbia and the forces of the great movements already visible among the Serbs, the Bulgars, and the Rumans. His

opinions were definite and clear, because he knew his subject. He was a devout Roman Catholic, but was not only tolerant of other people's opinion, but spoke on religious matters to men whom his Church would consider heretics with a frankness and sincerity which, to my knowledge, charmed one of them.

Dr. Washburn and he took a liking to each other which was creditable to both. Each was a distinctly pious man, each level-headed and clear-sighted. But one would hardly have expected that the devout Catholic and the devout Presbyterian should have exchanged religious experiences. Such, however, they did, and Dr. Washburn, after the death of Sir William, gave me a touching account of a conversation they had together of the religious experiences each had gone through, in which each had found the other in cordial sympathy. I should not be justified in entering into detail on this subject.

As Sir William White grew older he became stout and heavy, and this somewhat affected his vitality. To see him at his best was to have a private conversation with him. He always astonished me with the abundance of his knowledge of the statesmen of the Balkan Peninsula, of the history and of the tendency of each race. He knew German well and had married a German wife, and I think it may fairly be said that his tendency was to support the influence of Germany in Turkey. In so doing, I do not suggest for an instant that he was thinking of political results, but he recognised that there was a large field for German enterprise in Asia Minor; and I do not think I should be wrong in saying that his idea was that the larger the interest acquired by Germany in Asia Minor, the better guarantee did the Western Powers possess that Russia should not be allowed to have possession of Constantinople.

It was during Sir William White's time that an incident occurred of interest to myself. I received a letter from Sir Alfred Sandison, the First Dragoman to the Embassy. Let me say that this position in Constantinople is one of the

highest importance. Next to the Ambassador the First Dragoman is the Englishman of most influence in Turkey. Abdul Hamid, like his predecessor and successor, practically knew no language except Turkish. His flatterers, even in English newspapers, sometimes spoke of his excellent knowledge of French. That he had a smattering of the language is undoubtedly true, but he could no more keep up a conversation in that language than he could have done in Chinese. There are many messages which have to be given to His Majesty, many explanations, many conversations arising incidentally out of written or verbal communications which render it absolutely necessary that the representative of our Government should speak Turkish as well as he does English.

Mr. G. Fitzmaurice, the present First Dragoman, fulfils these requirements, and in addition has an exceptional knowledge of men and affairs. I remember him in his student dragoman days. He differed from most of his colleagues by passing a considerable portion of his time in the really Turkish cafés, by which I mean cafés frequented almost exclusively by Turks or Turkish subjects. In that way he acquired a knowledge of colloquial speech which is generally recognised as unsurpassed, and which no man can acquire by reading Turkish books.

Sir Alfred Sandison possessed the same kind of fulness of knowledge of Turkish. The son of a Scotsman, he had been born in Turkey, lived generally amongst the Turks, and was, to say the least, quite as familiar with Turkish as he was with English. Great confidence had been reposed in him by Sir William White and Lord Dufferin, and the only fault that I ever heard found with him was that he assumed too much authority and occasionally softened down messages which he considered likely to be offensive. Indeed, the story went that on one occasion he was suspended by Mr. Goschen for not giving the precise and clear-cut message which he had been entrusted to deliver to His Majesty. If he gave offence, as I believe he did in this respect, it was recognised that he had committed nothing more than an

error of judgment. Mr. Goschen was the Ambassador, and we all recognised that the duty of an interpreter was not to soften a hard message, but to give it in its entirety. I may add that it was pretty well known that Sir William White, and probably also Mr. Goschen, on most occasions discussed with Sandison what was the exact form in which a message should be given.

To return, however, to the letter which I received from him ; it reported a request from the Sultan that I should attend upon His Majesty at the palace. I wrote in reply, stating that I did not wish to see His Majesty, and did not propose to go to the palace unless I knew for what purpose I was going. Thereupon Sir Alfred Sandison came to see me. He declared that the Sultan had not given him any explanation, but that he was quite sure from the manner in which the request was made that it was not on an unpleasant matter, and that it might have a disagreeable effect if I did not comply with his request. I explained that my knowledge of Turkish was much too slight to engage in a conversation with His Majesty, but that I would go if I could be permitted to take my own interpreter. He at once promised that he would arrange this matter, and would obtain for me a *pusula* which would pass me through the various barriers at the palace and on to the room adjoining His Majesty's, occupied by his private and confidential secretary, Haji Ali.

The *pusula* was duly obtained, and, furnished with it and accompanied by my Armenian secretary, who had been with me since I entered Turkey, and who spoke Turkish as well as any Turk, I drove to Yildiz. In conversation during our drive I conjectured with my Dragoman what the object of the visit would be. He suggested that as Sandison had explained that he was convinced that the object was not a disagreeable one, the Sultan probably proposed to decorate me. I explained that I did not consider this probable, but if such a proposal were made I should refuse to receive the decoration. I remember the poor fellow being aghast at the suggestion. It would be considered as an insult. I

remarked that, as he was aware, I had on three separate occasions refused decorations offered by His Majesty's Ministers and also that when the suggestion was made that I should receive a Russian one I had said, in presence of two Russians, that if they were friends of mine they should prevent my being offered one. My secretary said that he knew of this, but the offer would probably mean that I was to receive a decoration from the Sultan's own hands, and in such case it would be difficult to refuse it. I then told him that he, acting as my Dragoman, had nothing to do but to repeat exactly what I said and give me a perfectly correct translation of the answer.

We arrived at the palace, and our *pusula* enabled us to pass right through into Haji Ali's room. I had not met the Haji before, but found him a fine old fellow, apparently a self-respecting Turk of the old school. I believe that he did not know even a smattering of any language except Turkish. When we entered he gave me a cordial greeting and said that his lord (effendimis) during several days had enquired after me, and wanted very much to make my acquaintance. He would go at once and inform him that I was present. He left the room, and after five minutes returned with a short note (an *aide mémoire*) stating that His Majesty had admired the work that I had done in the country, and wished to shew his esteem for me by presenting me with a decoration. I at once replied that while very grateful for the proposed honour, I preferred to remain undecorated. I may mention that my Dragoman knew my manner of speech so well that he could translate almost the inflexion of my voice, and that I knew Turkish sufficiently well to check what he said.

Haji Ali expressed his great surprise, and thinking, evidently, that I could not understand what he said, remarked, "What does this mean? Men come here prepared to pay heavily for decorations, to promise all sorts of service, and sometimes to intrigue in a rather low-down fashion to obtain them. Who is this man who is unwilling to receive a decoration?" I thereupon struck into the conversation myself, and made a remark to the effect that people outside

the palace spoke of him, Haji Ali, as an old-fashioned Turk. "I am an old-fashioned Englishman, and I do my work without thinking about decorations." The old fellow was pleased with the compliment, but still stated that he did not understand my attitude, unwillingness to receive what many coveted and intrigued to obtain. However, it was his duty to convey my answer to His Majesty in the next room, which he forthwith proceeded to do.

He was fully ten minutes or a quarter of an hour absent, and then returned with a still longer *aide mémoire*, which contained the Sultan's reply. Substantially, it was to this effect, that His Majesty did not wish to influence me in any way whatever as to what I should write, but that he knew that I was a distinguished Englishman working in his country, and that all he desired was to shew his respect for me, and he trusted that I would accept the decoration at his hands. I, of course, expressed my gratitude at His Majesty's desire to confer a favour on me, but added that if he would so permit I would take it as a favour if he would allow me to remain undecorated. Three times I had refused decorations from His Majesty's Ministers, and with his permission I would prefer to remain as I was.

Haji Ali again went into the Sultan's room, and after a considerable interval returned with the message that of course His Majesty could not press me to accept his decoration, though he again assured me it was offered as a mark of personal respect. "But," he added, "His Majesty commands me to tell you that if at any time he can do you a favour you are to let me, Haji Ali, know and it would be certain that His Majesty would grant it if he possibly could; or if you want *anything* you are to let me know. Lastly," said he, laughing as he gave the message, "His Majesty commands me not to let you leave the palace unless you give your promise that you will return." Under such circumstances I gave the promise that I would return. As a fact, a week or two afterwards I went again to the palace at a time when I considered it improbable that I should find Haji Ali, and, my expectation being correct, I left my card as evidence that

I had been there, and never entered the place again until Abdul Hamid was deposed.

As illustrative of the ignorance existing in the palace, and especially of the able, much-trusted and intelligent private secretary, I may mention the conversation which passed after that which I have recorded. Haji Ali asked my interpreter whether Mr. Pears wrote for the *Daily News*. The answer was in the affirmative. "Is it published in Galata or Pera?" The interpreter replied, "In neither." "Well," said he, "that is strange. Effendimis knows. He said it was not published in either of those places. But why is it published in Stambul?"

The interpreter explained that it was not published in Stambul but in London.

"Ah," said he, "my Effendi thought that it was. He knows everything."

When I returned with the impression fresh in my mind I wrote a full account of my visit and sent it to Sir Alfred Sandison. Probably it is buried away among the archives up to the present time.

I need say nothing about what was the motive influencing Abdul Hamid to send for me. On the following day I received a visit from the chief Armenian spy belonging to the palace, who, somewhat to my surprise, gave me a precise account of all that had passed, and then added that probably I had refused because I thought His Majesty was going to offer me a decoration of a low class. He was charged to say that this was a mistake, and that the Sultan proposed to give me the highest class of the Mejidieh excepting that which was reserved for members of Royal families. I told him that he was mistaken, and that if His Majesty had informed me that he was about to place around my neck the highest decoration, even set in brilliants, I should still have declined it. He then repeated the invitation given to apply to the palace if I wanted any personal favour. I was not going to discuss matters with him, though, of course, I knew perfectly well that what it meant was that if I wished payment in hard cash, or a subsidy from the palace purse, it was at my disposal.

The granting of Turkish decorations during Abdul Hamid's time, and even in that of his predecessor, had become so common that any value they may ever have possessed had ceased to exist in the minds of respectable people. The story was that Abdul Aziz had decorated his fighting cock with the order of the Mejidieh on the occasion of its defeating another. Abdul Hamid himself, who in the early years of his reign was rather fond of having theatrical performances in a beautiful little theatre in the grounds of Yildiz, almost invariably decorated the chief actress who performed before him. Nevertheless, in Turkey as elsewhere, there are crowds of people ready to intrigue and do dirty work in order to obtain the coveted button or ribbon. The importance that foreigners generally attach to decorations is curious. But I am disposed to think that the Turkish official class is the most profusely decorated of all.

CHAPTER XII

THE ARMENIAN MASSACRES

Popularity of "The Bosphorus Bull"—The Sacredness of the Sultan's *Tougra*—Baron Calice's Subtlety—Sir Philip Currie—Turkish Tobacco—The Armenians and Their Culture—Lord Byron and Their Tongue—The Desire for Education—Palmerston's Epigram—The "Yes Sirs"—Abdul Hamid and the Murdered Turk—An Armenian Tragedy—The Sultan's Resolve—Organised Massacre—A Terrible List of Victims—Death or Conversion—An Armenian's Report—A Great Outcry—Mr. Gordon Bennett in Constantinople—The *New York Herald's* Investigations—Abdul Hamid's Mistake—Mr. Hepworth's and Mr. Fitzmaurice's Reports—"Voluntary" Conversions—The Massacre in Urfa Cathedral.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFE'S mission was a special one, and Sir William White, during the same year, was also on a special mission. This had reference to the affairs of Egypt. In October, 1886, Sir William White returned to Constantinople as Special Ambassador, and three or four months afterwards as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. During the next four years, and until his death, he continued to act with great ability, and earned the respect, not merely of the Porte, but of the heads of the Orthodox and Armenian Churches. When he had a point to make, either at the Porte or at the palace, he submitted it in a plain and straightforward manner, so that there could be no mistake as to what he meant.

He was physically a big man, had naturally a loud voice, and when he became excited used it to such effect that, as I have said, the Turks spoke of him as "the Bosphorus Bull." Though many of the officials disliked him it was not because

of his manner or his voice, but on account of his persistency. The Turkish, and indeed the Eastern, mind generally has a tendency to intrigue, and, comparing our experiences together, Sir William and I were in accord that the successful diplomats were those who avoided anything of that kind, or of doing their business in an indirect fashion. The Eastern can usually beat an Englishman if he tries that game. "Make up your mind," said he, "what you want. State it clearly and you will beat the Eastern who tries the roundabout method of accomplishing his object." The conversation recalled General Ignatief's declaration that he deceived the Turks by always telling them the truth.

It was during Sir William's time in Constantinople that Sultan Abdul Hamid fully developed his powers of intrigue. He had got the Press entirely under his control. He had suppressed every form of public meeting. He had established a system of espionage so complete that the common expression in Constantinople was that if three Turkish subjects met together one at least would be a spy. It was then that Abdul began the game at which he considered himself an adept, of playing off one Embassy against another. Without any real knowledge of the world he was largely at the mercy of his army of spies, and the stories which were current in Constantinople of the importance that he attached to their reports confirmed this belief.

We shall see afterwards that when the Revolution of 1908 came, the numbers of "Journals," which was the name given to the reports of the spies, ran into many thousands. One illustration of the absurdity of listening to them may be given. Abdul had given a concession for the purchase and sale of tobacco *en régie* to the company known as the Régie Ottomane de Tabac. That Company had purchased from Austria millions of cigarette papers of the best quality, each one containing upon it the Sultan's *tougra*. One of the spies, months after the Régie was in full working, called His Majesty's attention to the fact that when a man smoked a cigarette he threw the end on the ground and trod on it

It was claimed that this was an indignity upon the sovereign. Thereupon an order was issued that no such cigarette paper should be employed. To have obeyed it meant a very heavy loss to the Régie Ottomane and perhaps a still greater one to the Austrian manufacturer. But it required all the great personal influence which the Directors of the Régie possessed, joined with that of the Austrian Ambassador, to induce the Sultan to rescind the order. The paper had come from Austria. Baron Calice, the Austrian Ambassador, was an experienced diplomatist, and one of his colleagues informed me at the time that the great argument which had been brought to bear upon Abdul Hamid was that a portrait of the Emperor was on each postage stamp, and that these were not only constantly trodden under foot but were stuck on with spit.

While on the subject of cigarettes, let me, as an old resident in Turkey, say something about smoking and tobacco. When I went to the country the old-fashioned Turks usually smoked either the hubble-bubble or a chibuk. Even now old-fashioned persons indulge in one or other method. Neither has taken root in England, nor is it desirable that either should do so. Though with the hubble-bubble the smoke is largely cleansed by passing through water, the amount of nicotine taken into the body is excessive. The chibuk was the fashionable method of smoking, or, as the Turks call it, of eating smoke. I was present many years ago during the sale of the personal property of Mustafa Fazil Pasha, an Egyptian Prince, brother, I believe, of Ismail, and was astonished at the number of mouthpieces that were sold. Usually they were from six to ten inches long, sometimes wholly of amber and studded with diamonds or other precious stones, some of them fetching as much as £150.

The cigarette is now the general form of smoking. The tobacco is a delicate plant, and varies greatly in different parts of the country. Consumers' tastes differ greatly. I remember one of my first visits to the late Halim Pasha, father of the present Grand Vizier. He was perhaps the wealthiest man in the country, and generously hospitable

to his guests. After I was seated he offered me a cigarette of the most expensive quality, which was described as "specially made for the palace." He then pulled out a drawer and took one of the cheapest for himself, indeed, of a kind smoked by the ordinary soldier and costing one piastre or two pence for a box of twenty. He burst out laughing when he saw that I had observed him, and remarked, "I keep those cigarettes," pointing to those from which I had taken mine, "for my friends, but to me they have no taste. These of the fourth quality are the only ones that are smokable."

The revenue from manufactured tobacco was given over, together with those from five other articles, to the Department of the Public Debt, which was charged with the administration of the conceded revenues for the benefit of the bondholders. Subsequently a great company was formed, which agreed to pay to the Government, through the Department of Public Debt, 750,000 Turkish pounds per annum. The Company managed this conceded revenue in trust (*en régie*) for the Government, and is now known throughout the world as the Ottoman Régie of Tobacco.

My experience has led me to have little confidence in the judgment of London tobacconists where cigarettes are concerned. I remember one night calling in at one of the most pretentious shops in the West End, and asking what cigarettes were to be had. The vendor said that he had the best cigarettes in London. They were smoked by Members of the House of Lords and others of the nobility, and their great recommendation was that they were made of Ayasaluk tobacco, a quality which he extolled in the highest terms. I surprised him by saying that he did not know what he was talking about; that not only had I been at Ayasaluk, but that anybody who knew Turkish tobacco was aware that it was a throat irritant of a very uncomfortable and even dangerous kind.

The great advantage of having Régie tobacco is that the smoker who has once had a cigarette which he likes is almost always certain to obtain others of the same quality

by obtaining cigarettes of the same denomination. The Ottoman Régie indeed is well managed, although the initials on its bales in Turkey, R.O.T., give a different suggestion. It has, however, never been heartily supported by the Government. It has a monopoly of the sale of tobacco in any form in the Empire. There are, however, whole provinces where it is next to impossible to get a Régie cigarette.

One of the stories by the late Hobart Pasha was that Sultan Abdul Hamid offered him a cigarette with the assurance that it was "not Régie." It is only fair to say that this was in the early days of the Régie, and before it had become so well organised as it was before the present war. Now that Cavalla and other districts which favour the growth of the tobacco plants best suited for cigarettes have ceased to be part of Turkey, it remains to be seen whether the Régie can continue to produce as good cigarettes as formerly.

Sir William White got on fairly well with the Sultan, though it cannot be said that he was a favourite. He was well liked by the British and other civil communities at Pera, and took a great interest in our English High School for Girls. The British and other colonies, and the Turks themselves, recognised that he possessed great capacity, a knowledge of affairs which prevented him putting forward any project without full consideration, and an unyielding determination to carry it through once he had made up his mind that it ought and could be carried through. He had, however, been in failing health for some months before his death, and it was not a great surprise to us to learn that on his visit to Berlin in January, 1892, he died.

In January, 1892, he was succeeded by Sir F. C. Ford, who came during a time of peace, and had no burning questions to deal with. He gave me the impression that in his intercourse with other ambassadors he found it better not to discuss politics unless he was charged with the specific duty of so doing. He was much interested in art, and especially in painting, but I fancy he found Constantinople an uncongenial

place, and left after some months, Mr. (afterwards Sir) E. Fane becoming Minister Plenipotentiary *ad interim*.

On January 1, 1894, Sir Philip W. Currie became Ambassador. He had never been stationed in Constantinople before, but he came to the city with a full knowledge of Turkish politics. As far back as the Conference in 1876-7 he had been Secretary to Lord Salisbury in Constantinople, and afterwards at the Berlin Congress. Subsequently he was Permanent Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He was a fine specimen of an English well-trained diplomat, and a worthy successor to Sir William White. Clear-sighted and intelligent, he soon gained the local knowledge which is always useful to an ambassador. He was a hard worker and, like Sir William White, took interest not merely in the more or less technical matters with which an ambassador has to deal and in commercial matters, but in the great human movements which are never absent from Turkey. It was during his time (from January 1, 1894, to April 1, 1898) that we had the full development of Abdul Hamid's malignity, especially towards the Armenians.

The story of the massacre of the Armenians requires little explanation here. Travellers have recognised for centuries that the Armenian population of Turkey, numbering about two millions, is a most valuable element in the country. The people, like ourselves, belong to the Indo-European race. A large portion of them occupy a mountainous country, and the men are usually stalwart and industrious. Their country was civilised and prosperous in the time of Christ, and I cannot doubt that the general average intelligence of Armenians is due to the fact that they are the descendants of parents who have been civilised for centuries, and possibly even millenniums. Armenia was the first country to establish Christianity as the religion of the State. Their great Christian teacher and national saint is Gregory the Illuminator.

Their Church has had a lengthy and continuous history. It was long recognised by the other great historical Churches

as one of equal authority with their own. There have been differences at times between the Holy Orthodox Church, the Nestorians and other Asiatic Churches, but these have long since been forgotten, and at the present time the Orthodox and the Armenian Churches get on well together in Constantinople and the Turkish Empire. The late Patriarch Joachim, for example, during the time of the great massacre of the Armenians, took occasion to visit officially the Armenian Patriarch, and to express the friendly feeling which had so long existed between the "sister Churches." A difference worth noting between the Greeks and the Armenians with reference to their Churches is that while the former confuses nationality and religion, the Armenians, from historical causes, have never felt the two to be necessarily coincident.

The Armenians furnished regiments and statesmen to the Greek Empire until its destruction. Even under Turkish rule, right down to the accession of Abdul Hamid, they supplied as many Ministers and officials in the Turkish department as did the Greeks. During several generations the leading Armenians saw the importance of education. The honour of first establishing schools amongst them belongs to the Roman Catholics, whose first missions to them date back to about 1720. Naturally these missions had as an object to detach Armenians from their national Church, or, as the Catholics called it, the Gregorian Church, to that of Rome, and in the cities and towns of the Empire this endeavour met with considerable success. Several congregations were formed; a separate religious community was officially recognised, whose members were correctly spoken of as Armenian Catholics, as distinguished from Roman Catholics. They are of course in union with Rome.

The Armenians at the time of our Protestant reformation in the West were greatly interested in it, a fact which I mention to shew that their general interest in religious movements is not of recent growth. Two religious "communities" were established outside Turkey, mostly, I believe, by the efforts and with the money of one Armenian, the first in Vienna

and the second in Venice, and both known after their founder as Mekitarists. Probably many of my readers have visited the island of San Lazzaro in Venice, where there is a community of Armenian monks, with an interesting library and collection of pictures. Lord Byron went there, and the monks shew his exercises in the Armenian language. In writing on the subject, Byron suggests that his mind is getting flabby, and that he has taken up with Armenian as a stiff study. The monks there, too, are proud of the testimony in their visitors' book given by John Ruskin, and, unless my memory is at fault, by Mr. Gladstone. It is interesting to see their collection of pictures, because I have often remarked on the absence of artistic talent amongst the Greeks as compared with the Armenians. It is rare to visit the house of an Armenian in a fairly prosperous condition where there is not evidence of artistic and musical taste: pictures or a piano, or other musical instruments.

Stimulated by the example of the Roman Catholic missions, which were followed up afterwards by American Protestant missions, a zeal for education became widespread through the race. The first year I spent in Turkey I was taken on a Sunday morning to a large Armenian church, and saw a number of hamals, men of the porter class, who were struggling hard with the mystery of pot-hooks and elementary lessons in reading and writing. It was a pleasant and pathetic sight. None of them, I fancy, needed the stimulus which the schoolmaster in *Adam Bede* had to apply to his scholars. Their heart was in the business.

A community with the desire for education is not likely to sit quietly under Turkish or other misrule, and in a very real sense it may be said that the fomenters of political agitation in Armenia, as in Bulgaria, were the schoolmasters and the missions, Catholic or Protestant. The Turks, amongst whom the Armenians are generally dispersed, resented this desire for instruction and closed the schools. It did not occur to them for many years to open Turkish schools, even in districts where the Armenians spoke only Turkish. I had learnt that such districts were not uncommon through

having to work up a case regarding an alleged Armenian estate dating back to about 1780. A large number of undoubtedly genuine Armenian letters of that date had been preserved in a monastery and had to be translated. I then saw not only that the Armenians were bitterly persecuted, but that they were forbidden to speak their own language, under penalty of having the tongue cut out if they did so.

To this hour, indeed, there are many Armenian villages where Turkish is the only language understood. Even in Constantinople for some years after my arrival there were published three newspapers in the Turkish language, but printed in Armenian characters. I may mention incidentally that the Armenian script is purely phonetic, so that once the learner has acquired a knowledge of its thirty-seven characters he can read with the same facility with which a man can read in Italian or German once he has learned his letters. During the last forty years the Armenian community has made splendid and generally successful efforts to improve the teaching in its schools, and with the result that the language is now better known than it was a century ago. But, as I have said, all this interest in education was looked on with the utmost suspicion by the Turks, and the Armenian question had already become a European one when the Congress of Berlin met in 1878. An effort was there made to improve the conditions of the Armenians. The Treaty provided for the drafting of reforms to be submitted by the Porte to the Powers, who were to be notified also of their execution.

Accordingly, when Sir Henry Layard succeeded Sir Henry Elliot he was instructed, as I have already stated, to endeavour to persuade the Porte to adopt a scheme of reforms which should secure better protection of life and property in the provinces inhabited by Armenians. Even in the days of his comparative youth, when he was making a reputation by his discoveries at Nineveh, Layard had seen the oppression of the Armenians. Yet in spite of the story that Palmerston said he would forgive Layard for discovering Nineveh but could not forgive Nineveh for discovering Layard, there are

indications in his narrative that his sturdy English sense revolted at the Turkish treatment of both Arabs and Christians. Some of his best coadjutors even were Armenians. He made a lamentable failure, as also has been said. The only shadow of a reform which he succeeded in obtaining was that the sub-governors in the provinces where there were Armenians should belong to that race. They were appointed, and of course were men chosen for their subserviency, and soon received the nickname of "Yes Sirs" (*Effet Effendim*), because they were believed invariably to acquiesce in what their chief proposed.

The condition of disorder in Armenia had gradually become worse instead of better. Then Abdul Hamid seems to have determined to try his own hand at statesmanship. Men were arrested on the slightest pretext and thrown into prison. I remember one instance, simple but typical, which Sir Philip Currie told me of at the time it occurred. A Turk had been murdered in a large village in Armenia. Had it been a Christian no one except perhaps members of his own family would have taken any notice of the occurrence. The majority of the inhabitants were Armenians and every man was immediately thrown into prison. Many of them were subjected to torture of the most hideous kind, one of the commonest forms indeed being such as I cannot describe. Our Consul made a representation of the facts to Sir Philip and he immediately determined to do what he could to save the miserable victims. I saw him the day after he had made a visit on the subject to the Sultan. He told me how he had described the tortures. His Majesty answered, "But a Moslem has been killed," leaving the impression on Sir Philip that of course in such case the authorities were justified in arresting all the Armenians in order to find out who was the culprit.

Sir Philip explained that in England the police would have set to work to find out who it was and the man would have been punished in due course of law. But all to no effect. The Sultan promised that he would enquire into the matter, but Sir Philip subsequently told me that the persecution of

the Armenians in that village had not ceased, and that the torturers had not been punished. Armenia being a long distance from Constantinople, with practically no means of communication, the roads being hideously bad and the telegraph being exclusively in the hands of the Turks, it was only when letters came by the long sea-route under consular seal that the truth could be learned. In such letters, especially from those of American and Catholic missionaries, the stories of cruelty that were told were ghastly, nor were they confined to the persecution of Armenians. Notwithstanding that many years earlier the great Ambassador Canning had obtained the "Hatti-houmayoun," which was described at the time as the *Magna Carta* of religious liberty in Turkey, a really great triumph justly put down to the credit of our country, religious liberty did not exist, even among the Moslems.

Let me give one of the stories about Armenia in Sir Philip's time which is well founded. A number of Moslems, headed by the Ulema of the village, had somehow arrived at the conviction that Christianity was a divine revelation, and that its teaching rather than that of the Koran ought to be their guide. They had held various secret meetings without the intervention, so far as could be learned, of priest or missionary, and concluded that it was their duty to profess Christianity. They knew, however, that to do so would mean death, for to suppose that any Moslem in the interior of Asia Minor could be permitted to change his faith was unthinkable. About thirty of them determined therefore to leave the country, and to emigrate to America, where they were informed they might profess any religion they liked. They were simple-minded peasants, and applied to their Christian neighbours as to the means of getting to America. They had sufficient money to pay their passages. They started in a body for Constantinople, but they never arrived there. They disappeared by the way. An American missionary, who was interested in this remarkable spontaneous movement on the part of his neighbours, managed to get his letters sent through to Constantinople to some of his

colleagues, with a suggestion that they should be aided on their arrival. It was difficult to follow their course towards the capital, but traces of them were obtained in different places. The general belief was and is that they were all murdered on the way.

Readers will recognise that with such a spirit of hostility towards everything Christian the Armenians continued to have a bad time. The inevitable result followed. The ardent spirits among them joined their brethren the Russian Armenians across the border and made futile attempts to raise a rebellion. Such attempts were repeated and invariably led to the slaughter of innocent persons. Some Armenians had reached Paris and England and naturally endeavoured to arouse sympathy with those who were in open rebellion against Turks. I refused to praise the rebels. In one of the papers published in Paris by the hot-heads among them, I was personally denounced for not supporting these Armenian revolts. The charge against me was justified by my silence on the subject. Russia at the time was hostile to the Armenians, and was endeavouring to force those who were in Russia to abandon their ancient Church and to join the Orthodox Church of Russia.

Under such circumstances the revolt of a handful of Armenians had not a chance of success and was therefore unjustifiable. As a friend to the Armenians, revolt seemed to me purely mischievous. Some of the extremists declared that while they recognised that hundreds of innocent persons suffered from each of these attempts, they could provoke a big massacre which would bring in foreign intervention. Such intervention was useless so long as Russia was hostile. Lord Salisbury had publicly declared that as he could not get a fleet over the Taurus he did not see how England could help the Armenians, much as she sympathised with them.

The result of the failure of these attempts at revolt was that Abdul Hamid determined once and for all to make revolt impossible. It was commonly said that he had made up his mind to exterminate the Armenian population. It may well be doubted whether he deliberately contemplated

a step so difficult. But he and some of his creatures organised a series of massacres such as had not been seen in any European country for upwards of a century. In making his preparations he took all steps he could devise to prevent the truth becoming known. Every letter sent to or coming from Asia Minor was opened, and when delivered was intentionally left open. Foreigners as well as Turkish subjects were forbidden to go into the provinces where Armenians abounded. The system of local passports had already become so strict that no person was allowed to travel in the country, even from one village to another, without possessing one. The regulations, of course applying both to Turkish subjects and foreigners, disorganised business throughout the country.

As to how they worked, let me give an illustration from my own experience. I was then a director of a company for the manufacture of cotton yarn, which women of the country weave into cloth. Our travellers, some of whom were Armenians, were chosen for their business ability irrespective of their race or religion. But the Armenian travellers were useless, for no Armenian was permitted to have a local passport. One of our customers, whom I may give as an illustration, took a considerable quantity of our goods and sold them to many persons in neighbouring towns and villages and even in Constantinople. He had paid regularly. He applied to us to employ our influence to obtain the *teskeri*, or local passport, in order that he might collect the money due to him. No one doubted after reading the particulars which he gave of his creditors that his statement was true. But though these facts were laid before the palace, even by Turkish members of our board, and although it was pointed out that the man in question had never been engaged in political intrigue, the permission was refused.

When all arrangements had been made for preventing news coming from Armenia, Abdul Hamid set about the task which he called giving the Armenians a lesson. Emissaries were sent into the provinces. The Moslems were invited to

assemble in the mosques, were informed of the Sultan's plan, and told that they were at liberty to take their neighbours' goods and to kill them if any resistance was made.

In one or two cases—lamentably rare, I am afraid—the emissary was opposed in the mosque by the man who would correspond to the parish priest. One brave fellow rose to speak after the emissary had proclaimed his mission and boldly stated that he did not believe that the Padishah had sent any such orders, but if he had done so he would still oppose their execution. "You know me," said the venerable old man, "as a good Moslem. The teaching of Islam is that we are not permitted to kill unbelievers unless they are in rebellion. There is not a man among you who dare say that the Armenians in this town are rebels. Therefore, if even the order come from the Padishah, I say that I will not be party to their execution, and that in the day of judgment I will accuse anyone who kills his Armenian neighbour, and let it be known that it was done after my warning that it was unlawful to do so." Nevertheless a great massacre took place in that city next day.

The precautions that Abdul Hamid had taken to prevent news being transmitted of his devilish work were largely successful. Very few private letters were smuggled into Constantinople from the area of the massacre, the fullest account of the early stages having been sent by way of Russia to the *Daily Telegraph*. The lowest serious estimate that has been made of the victims killed is 100,000. Sir William Ramsay's estimate of a quarter of a million of victims is probably not too high, if to the number of those actually killed are added those who died of starvation and other consequential causes. Gradually the news came through of atrocities and of forced conversions to Mahometanism. I read the letter received by a servant from his wife, of which I regret I did not take a copy. Substantially it was to the following effect: "I pray that you and God will pardon me for changing my religion, but I had to do it. Several Turks came to me and my sister and said, 'You must become Moslems or we shall kill you.' Our three children

were with me. One of them seized little Andon (six years old) and held a big knife to his throat, threatening to kill him at once unless I changed. You know, my dear husband, how we both love that boy, and, God forgive me, I became a Moslem. The others also turned. They tell us that after two or three years we shall forget that we have been Christians and be contented to be Turks."

I collected and published at the time a number of cases which I had obtained from American missionaries and from Consuls, British and others. Let it be remembered that in all these cases of massacre the victim could have saved his or herself if he had lifted up his hand and pronounced the "esh-had" or confession of faith. They are all therefore entitled to be classed as martyrs, and the collection of stories which I made and sent to the *Daily News* appeared under the heading, "The noble army of martyrs praise Thee."

Meantime no official or full account of the massacres had been given to the world. Among the first to go over the ground was a young American who was then in my chambers, who spoke Turkish well, and who accompanied a newspaper correspondent, the two travelling as an engineer (and making fictitious drawings of the country) and his interpreter. Then a great outcry arose in England, America, and other civilised countries about the massacres in question, their extent and their cruelty. Private letters began to get through, mostly by way of Russia.

Abdul Hamid was informed that some account, official or otherwise, ought to be published. Then a happy thought occurred to him. Mr. Gordon Bennett of the *New York Herald* arrived in Constantinople, and as he represented a country which had no political interest in Turkey it appeared to the Sultan that he would serve as a useful tool for his purposes. Abdul Hamid was never a good judge of men, and he never made a greater mistake than in supposing that he could hoodwink Mr. Bennett. What the *New York Herald* wanted was news, honest news, not Turkish lies. What the Sultan wanted was that someone should be sent into Armenia who would paint the Armenians very black and

the Sultan as the father who loved all his children equally, to employ a favourite expression of Abdul Hamid in reference to his subjects.

Now there happened to be at that time in Constantinople a writer of great intelligence and industry. I believe that he had already received a high decoration from the Sultan, but if not then he received a little later the highest the Sultan bestows outside reigning families. I believe that his visit regarded some perfectly legitimate concession from His Majesty. But it was believed that his interests were bound up with the necessity of keeping on good terms with His Majesty, and when it was known that in accordance with the Sultan's suggestion this writer was to be sent by Mr. Bennett to make a report on the doings in Armenia, something like consternation fell over all persons who wished the truth to be known.

Dr. Washburn, who was the most distinguished American in Turkey (and now that he has joined the majority I may mention that I am aware that the post of Ambassador to the Porte was offered to him) had always befriended the Armenians. He and I and a few others felt that a great disaster was imminent if an American newspaper having the circulation and influence of the *New York Herald* were to give a one-sided account of the doings in Armenia. Dr. Washburn agreed to see Mr. Bennett. He recounted to me the interview he had with him. He found, as might have been expected, that that gentleman was not a partisan, and recognised that a report by the person approved by him on the recommendation of the Sultan might not give a correct version of the facts. They consulted together, with the result that on behalf of the *New York Herald* Mr. Hepworth should accompany the original nominee. His report* was published in England and is of great value. Mr. Hepworth, in the preface to his book, tells us that from the first he intended to be impartial. He kept his promise, and his book indicates clear insight and the determination to resist

* *Through Armenia on Horseback*. Isbister and Co., 1898.

all temptation to pervert truth. It is the work of a high-minded and trustworthy man. His narrative shews that instructions had been given to the Turks who accompanied him to let him only see the Turkish side of the question.

I do not propose to write at any length about the Armenian massacres—the foulest crime which can justly be laid to the charge of Abdul Hamid. I refer readers who wish to see more about them to my book *Turkey and its People*. Those for whom the summary of evidence there given is not sufficient will find abundance of trustworthy information in Mr. Hepworth's book, and still more in a report of Mr. George Fitzmaurice, now the First Embassy Dragoman at Constantinople, published in a Blue Book, *Turkey No. 5*, 1896.

I have already spoken of the ability and trustworthiness of Mr. Fitzmaurice. I am not aware that he and Mr. Hepworth ever met, but there is substantial harmony between their reports. Both relate that the victims could have saved their lives if they had been willing to accept Islam. In one town, Birajek, the Turkish officer had asked the Christians to surrender their arms, because then he could and would protect them but not otherwise. They trusted in the Moslem's word, gave up their arms; but the officer in charge of the troops refused to protect them. Every Armenian house, whether Gregorian, Catholic, or Protestant, was pillaged and destroyed. Here, as happened in several places, a kindly Moslem tried to protect the Christians. In Birajek such a request was refused. In other places Christians were sheltered by good Moslems, who afterwards were exposed to the vengeance of the Turkish authorities for having done so. In Birajek a woman ascended the roof of a house in which a great number of Christians had taken refuge, and waving a white flag, declared that all had become Moslems. As Mr. Fitzmaurice says, "they had accepted Islam to save their lives, to save themselves from certain death." A great many conversions to the Moslem faith had been made, and the Government had the impudence to declare that they were voluntary con-

versions. One of the objects of Mr. Fitzmaurice's visit was to learn whether this statement was true or false. He found it false. Even when he was there the fanatics were determined to kill any convert who renounced Islam.

The most cruel outrage in the Armenian massacres took place in the Armenian cathedral at Urfa, on Sunday, December 29, 1896. The Christians had been deceived by a Moslem mob into believing that they would be unmolested in the great church; and, on the Sunday morning, at least 3,000 persons had there assembled. When Mr. Fitzmaurice saw it he was able to read on one of the pillars of the church a record by the priest that he had administered last communion to 1,800 members of his flock. These, with other Armenians, were intentionally burnt to death in the cathedral.

When the mob broke in with a rush they killed all who were on the ground floor, these being nearly all men, the women and children being in the gallery. They mockingly called on Christ to prove that He was a greater prophet than Mahomet. In the meantime, while revolver and other shots were being discharged against the occupants of the gallery, native mattresses, yorghans or duvets, the straw matting which covered the floor, and other combustibles were piled up for a big fire. Thirty cans of petroleum were poured over them and fire set to the mass. Abdul Hamid had avenged himself, and a deed of devilry had been done, worse in its extent than even the slaughter of Batak in Bulgaria in 1876.

Abdul Hamid became emboldened by the success of his own savagery. In England, France, and America notices of these massacres appeared shortly after they took place. But the news trickled through in such small quantity that it did not create anything like the same effect as the news of the Moslem atrocities in Bulgaria. The outrages had been confined to the Eastern portion of Asia Minor.

In 1897, however, Abdul Hamid tried a bolder move in Constantinople itself. Once more the forces of disorder were carefully organised to attack the Armenians. Once more the slaughter was to be indiscriminate. The word was

passed that if the Armenian guardians of shops and offices, together with the hamals or porters, could be killed off, their places could be taken by Turks and Kurds from the interior. In preparation for the massacre, sticks or clubs were prepared, largely fitted with a piece of "angle iron," and at a given signal Moslem mobs with zaptiehs, or policemen, accompanying them paraded Stambul, Galata, and Pera, with the object of killing every Armenian they could find. No European was molested. My son was out in the streets of Galata and told me he saw an old man get one heavy knock on the head and fall dead. Immediately beneath my own chambers was a small but quite respectable café, much frequented by Armenians. The Moslem mob burst in and killed six persons. One managed to escape from the back door and climbed up, in a way that I should have thought impossible, to a window which belonged to a back room of my chambers. He was, of course, allowed to enter.

Meantime Europeans who had Armenians in their employ closed and barricaded their doors, which are usually of iron in the best part of Galata, and awaited events. My son, curious to know what was going on in the immediate neighbourhood, put his head out of the window, and immediately saw a Turkish soldier level his rifle against him. He withdrew in time. The streets of Galata and of Stambul were full of fugitive Armenians, followed by the Moslem dregs of the population armed with the sticks and clubs I have mentioned, and hence called *sopajis*. One of my Armenian hamals had been sent upon an errand when the outbreak took place. He saw his fellow countrymen being killed and took shelter amid the intricacies of the sub-structure of old Galata Bridge. There during the rest of the day and the whole of the night he remained in wild alarm. On the next day he ventured to get on board a neighbouring steamer going to Kadikewi and took refuge in my son's house, but the adventures through which he had passed had turned his brain, and he was never the same man again.

The Armenians generally behaved well in Constantinople. One story told me by a colleague is worth mentioning. He

was working at the powder factory at Macrikewi, was an old man, a skilled and steady workman, and had proved himself such during forty years. He was liked by his Moslem companions. When the mob came to kill all the Armenians in and about the factory, an old fellow-worker, who had an army revolver with six shots, gave it to him with the remark that he could not protect him, but that he might take the revolver and do for some of his enemies. The old fellow took it at first gladly. Ten minutes after he brought it back to his friend, thanked him and said, " You and I have always been good friends, but I have never soiled my hands with a man's blood. I am sure to be killed and do not wish to appear in the presence of Allah with the life of a man on my conscience."

I must tell the story of a noble-minded Quakeress, Miss Burgess, much respected by all the British community. She had established an orphanage in the Armenian quarter of Kum Kapou in Stambul. I have often been at the institution and, like many others, have wondered at and admired her great humanitarian work. She had already upwards of a hundred Armenian girls who attended her school. She had other useful agencies in connection with her institution giving employment to Armenian women, who are generally skilled in embroidery and other forms of needlework. When the attack upon the Armenians commenced this quarter was one of the first aimed at. Hundreds of Armenians in the neighbourhood were killed. Miss Burgess closed her doors for the protection of those confided to her care, and was soon visited by the mob. She had already sent a message to the British Consul, a distance of about two miles, who replied urging her strongly to leave the place and come over to Galata. Those who know Miss Burgess would know the indignation which she put into her reply that she was not going to leave her Armenian girls unprotected. She would share their fate. Thereupon the Consul pressed her to hoist the British flag.

When she received this message the rioting had become so great that there was no chance of sending across the Golden

Horn, where a British flag might have been purchased. Accordingly she determined to make one, and her efforts, as she told me the story, had their amusing side. They had a certain quantity of red and of blue cotton, and many willing hands for sewing. But, like the majority of English women, she had crude ideas as to the formation of the Union Jack. However, they made the best that they could, stitching the white and blue on the red. Probably the resemblance was sufficiently good for deceiving the ordinary Turk. They managed to find a long broom-handle which served as a flagstaff, and hoisted the flag out of the window, pulling up a corner and fixing it in such a fashion that only the side to which the red and blue were sewn could be seen. Presently a detachment of soldiers came round and the officer asked what the flag meant. The answer was that it was British, but as the soldier spoke no other language but Turkish he at once procured the attendance of an officer who spoke a little French. Once more asked the meaning, Miss Burgess referred him to the British Ambassador, and she and her Armenian children were not further molested.

Though I am anticipating, I may as well add some further particulars about this useful institution. Its utility and the catholicity with which it was managed appealed to us all. There was an annual meeting, which continued down to 1913, of its friends and supporters. Sir Nicholas and Lady O'Connor, though both devout Roman Catholics, took great interest in its work. The Rev. Robert Frew, a Scotch Presbyterian, was always ready to give any aid he could. The Moslems in the neighbourhood, moved by the self-sacrificing spirit of Miss Burgess and the other ladies with her, recognising that they were not seeking to make any profit for themselves, came to respect her and her work.

The old Iman, corresponding to the parish priest, dare not visit the institution before the Revolution of 1908 broke out; but once religious liberty was proclaimed by the Young Turks, went there to express delight that these English foreigners should go among them to teach. He knew that in the evening schools there were young Moslems as well as

Armenians, and that the same attention was given to them as to the Christians. Then he became curious to know what the religious teaching was. He had often heard singing in the building, but now he entered. Around the walls of the principal room were a number of translations into Turkish of English hymns, but in Armenian characters, and he was interested to know what they said. He got an Armenian to read them and then wrote the words in Turkish characters and joined lustily, if not musically, in the singing.

Sir Philip Currie acted well in regard to the massacres, and induced most of his colleagues to join him in representations to the Sultan. Appointed in January, 1894, he was absent on leave for a short time in the early part of November, 1895, and it was then the first massacre in Constantinople occurred. During his absence Mr. Michael Herbert, not then knighted, was Chargé d'Affaires. At that time the Embassy was still at its country residence at Therapia, and even there several Armenians were killed, and one victim lay dead in front of the Embassy. Mr. Herbert saw his colleagues, and after a good deal of persuasion obtained their consent to send an open telegram to the Sultan at the palace, which I quote from memory, to the effect that this thing "must cease immediately or there would be danger to the throne and to the dynasty." The sting was in the last word. The open message had its immediate effect, orders being at once sent to put an end to the massacre. They stopped with the same precision as they had commenced. Nothing could have been better, and indeed Mr. Herbert then, and in everything he did in Constantinople, proved himself a worthy representative of his country.

When Sir Philip returned he took up the same strong line which Mr. Herbert had initiated, and did not hesitate to express his opinion of Abdul Hamid's conduct with the utmost freedom. Hence he became hated by the Sultan. Then Abdul Hamid tried one of the mean tricks to which he was addicted. He appointed a commission to enquire into the origin of the massacre in Constantinople and named

men who dared not express any opinion of their own, and who were certain to make a report throwing the onus of the disturbance upon the Armenians. But to give the appearance of wishing to have an honest report, he placed upon the commission my dear old friend General Blunt. Blunt was the last remaining gendarmerie officer who had been brought out by Baker Pasha, when Sir Henry Layard had persuaded him that if he would name a number of English officers who should be employed in the organisation of gendarmerie, this would have a great influence on English public opinion. As a matter of fact Blunt was an honest English gentleman, as incapable of lying or of doing a dishonourable act as any man I ever met with. It was thought, however, by the Sultan and his gang that he could not afford to risk his salary from the Sultan and would sell his soul for the Padishah's pay.

The commission set to work, and inasmuch as the killing of the six Armenians in the quarter near my chambers already mentioned was notorious, the members came to collect evidence. One of the points in particular which they proposed to establish was that no soldier or gendarme had accompanied the murderers, or countenanced them. My son told his story, and the stupid commissioners tried to persuade him that he had been mistaken. It was more than they could do. When they had written their report, in Turkish of course, they wished him to sign it without having it translated to him. When they refused he declined to sign it, and made a report of what he had done to Sir Philip. The Ambassador told me that he had heard of similar conduct in connection with other people, and that the whole report was sure to be so ridiculous that he, with some of his colleagues, had refused to take any notice of it. I believe that, as a matter of fact, it never saw the light.

While the outrages were going on, we in Constantinople constantly heard of instances of Englishmen and Frenchmen protecting individual Armenians from the brutality of Abdul Hamid's agents. It is not too much to say that most

decent-minded people, but especially those of England and France, were engaged in a tacit conspiracy to defeat the Sultan's designs against the Armenians. They acted in conformity with their traditions in the East, because, as I have elsewhere said, during the massacre of Chios the British and French inhabitants of Smyrna and elsewhere were always ready to assist the desolate and oppressed, even at considerable risk to their own lives and property.

Let me mention two such cases which occurred in Constantinople during the worst period of the persecution of the Armenians in the capital. By virtue of the capitulations, under which life under Turkish rule was possible, no right was better established than that a British or French ship was foreign territory upon which no Turkish police officer could enter, except by the permission of the authority, British or French, to which she belonged. The indignation amongst French sailors was a fine, honest sentiment, and to hear a French captain or one of his crew denouncing the brutalities which they heard of as being perpetrated on shore did one good and improved one's knowledge of *argot*. An Armenian fugitive took refuge on board a *Messagerie* steamer. Spies were always on the lookout in the harbour for fugitives. Half an hour afterwards a Turkish police-boat came alongside the *Messagerie*, and the officer in full uniform mounted the ladder. At the top there stood a sturdy French boatswain on duty to see that no unauthorised person went on board. When the Turkish officer reached the deck the boatswain respectfully asked him what he wanted, to which the reply was :

"Don't you see that I am a Turkish officer? That is all I have to say to you."

"No," said the French boatswain, "you can't come here without a permit."

"But I am coming," said he, and began to draw his sword.

The boatswain seized him, pinned him by the arms, and called for assistance, which was very willingly given. The Turk spoke French, struggled hard, and claimed that he had

the right to search the ship. Thereupon the boatswain and others tied him to the mast and took his sword from him. They then signalled to the French Dispatch boat or *Stationnaire*, which at once sent a boat's crew, who carried him off to the *Stationnaire*. Thereupon the captain wrote to the Turkish head of the water police to say that he had a Turkish officer on board who had been trespassing on French territory, and that they were prepared to give him up for punishment. When the incident became known in Constantinople everybody was prepared to give a cheer for the French Johnny.

A still more striking instance occurred at Ismidt, the ancient Nicomedia. There was and is in that city an Armenian Catholic monastery which was under French protection. The Governor, knowing that such an act would be agreeable to his imperial master, pulled down the French flag and expelled the monks. The matter was at once reported to the French Ambassador, who determined to teach the Turk to respect the national flag. He let it be known that next day his ship would proceed to Ismidt and that he would publicly reinstall the monks with the French flag floating over them. Spies brought word of the intended action to the palace. Abdul Hamid was in a great flurry and excitement. He would apologise and was ready to make any terms, provided that this public defiance of what was apparently done under his authority were waived. But the French Ambassador and captain were obdurate. Of course His Majesty would apologise, but as the insult was public the reparation must also be public. Nothing that could be said and nothing that was said could induce them to vary their purpose. The ship went to Ismidt, the men were landed with fixed bayonets, the French flag flew aloft at the head of their procession through the streets of the ancient city, and the monks were reinstalled in the monastery, over which the French flag again flew.

The incidents are mentioned as illustrating the healthy tone of British and French opinion in Constantinople. I would gladly add illustrations of a similar spirit amongst the

Germans, but I do not know of any. Englishmen and Frenchmen insist upon expressing their opinion on such matters. Germans do not. I know many Germans in Turkey for whom I have great respect, and some of whom, notwithstanding this hideous war, I hope to count as my friends as long as I live, but at that time in Turkey they seem to have been possessed by the idea that it was in the interest of their country that they should do nothing to lose the favour of Abdul Hamid. Privately they expressed their loathing at what he did, and, as I shall have occasion to mention later on, their painstaking and singularly able Ambassador, Marschall von Bieberstein, could put his foot down very effectually when the interests of his country or even of private German citizens were concerned, and certainly never gave me the impression that he regarded the Sultan with more respect than he deserved.

CHAPTER XIII

THE TURKISH METHOD

Turkish Fleet Neglected, but Added to Under Strange Circumstances—Kutchuk Saïd Takes Refuge at British Embassy—Is Protected by Sir Philip Currie—Girding on the Sword of Osman—Hamdi Bey—Allaverdi—Bishop Wordsworth's Visit—Lady Currie's Popularity—A Cultured Woman—The Spy's Invitation—The Young Turks' Indiscretion—The Secretary's Dilemma—A Counter Offensive—An Uncompromising Retort—Espionage—The Englishmen and the Female Spy—The Armenian Patriarch—An Impressive Ceremony—The Patriarch's Cordiality.

THE story of the Turkish fleet during Abdul Hamid's reign gives the measure of the capacity of this sovereign whom it pleased sycophants to speak of as singularly intelligent. When he came to the throne the Turkish fleet was probably the third most powerful in the world. The ships made a gallant show. During the summer months of the year they were anchored in the Bosphorus, and from the two great imperial palaces of Dolma Bagsche and Cheragan were an imposing sight. Two hundred British workmen at the arsenal on the Golden Horn kept them in good repair and occupied their time in completing new ships.

In 1876, when Abdul Aziz was deposed, the fleet took a large share in the revolution. When the successor of Abdul Aziz, Murad, was deposed, and Abdul Hamid was girded with the sword of Osman, the dominant element in his character soon shewed itself. That element was always suspicion. The ships were sent into the harbour of the

Golden Horn and there nearly the whole of them remained until his deposition. Within five years of his accession all the British engineers and workmen were sent home, with the exception of about half a dozen. The ships were neglected, their boilers were not attended to, and they steadily deteriorated. Only once during his reign were any of them allowed to leave the Golden Horn.

During the Greek war of 1897 four ironclads, two cruisers, and five smaller vessels were sent to the Dardanelles, but were never allowed to go any farther. The larger vessels were unable to steam more than six knots an hour. Abdul Hamid, however, purchased twenty torpedo boats from France. When delivered in the Golden Horn they were duly paid for, and then it seemed that they had answered the purpose for which they were bought. They remained for years almost entirely without practice, but as the Ministers who had made the purchase had received their commission, neither they nor the Sultan seemed to trouble themselves any more about them.

At a later date Abdul Hamid, however, did add three large ironclads to the fleet, and the story of their acquisition would make a good subject for opera bouffe. They were fine vessels; I say were, for during the last six months two of them have gone to the bottom. One was built by Armstrongs of Newcastle, a second by the American firm of Cramps, and the third was either built in France or by Ansaldo of Genoa. They were ordered between 1896 and 1900. As already mentioned, the ships possessed by Turkey were not allowed to proceed farther than the Dardanelles. Why then did the Sultan want new ships? The answer is to be found in the curious intellect of the Sultan.

During the Armenian massacres the property of subjects of America, France, Italy, and Great Britain was greatly damaged. It was absolutely right that the Turkish Government should compensate these foreign subjects. The representatives of the Powers interested demanded compensation. The Porte, at the instigation of the Sultan, refused to pay anything, maintaining that foreigners must

suffer the damages which resulted from internal disorder just as did Ottoman subjects. But the Powers knew that these outrages had been ordered by Abdul Hamid himself, and supervised by his subordinates. They therefore persisted in their demands and began to speak in a tone which necessarily implied that force would be employed to obtain compensation.

Then in one way or another a fine opera bouffe solution occurred to Abdul Hamid, by which he could satisfy the demands of the respective States, and yet refuse to have it shewn that he had recognised the validity of such demands. He sent for the American Minister and with great secrecy requested that Cramps' agent should attend at the palace. The American Minister at the time was Mr. Griscom, a young man belonging to a charming family representing the best type of American Quakers. Cramps' agent attended. The style of ship was fixed upon, all the details carefully considered, the contract duly prepared and the order for a ship given. Then the agent was informed that to the price he must add the sum of so many pounds, being the amount claimed by the American Minister as compensation for the damage done to American citizens. This sum was to be paid to the Minister. He, of course, would do what he liked with it.

In this way the Sultan judged that he had avoided the recognition of American claims and had satisfied the American Minister, but secrecy was strictly enjoined. When, two or three days afterwards, I mentioned the condition at the American Legation, astonishment was expressed that I knew, and I had to give the assurance, which I gave very freely, that I had not received my information from anybody connected with the Legation. In fact, it had then become public property. A like procedure was gone through with Armstrongs in reference to the British claims, and with the French and Italian builders. In regard to Italy, the proceedings were slightly varied. One of the old ironclads was sent to Ansaldo at Genoa to be repaired and fitted, and the Italian claims were added to the price.

The new ships took their place in the Golden Horn, and little was done to them until about 1909. The British Government lent the services of Admiral Gamble and subsequently of Admiral Williams, who again was succeeded by Admiral Limpus, who remained in the Turkish service until September or October, 1914. Let me make a statement which will not be disputed by anyone who knows the Turkish fleet. Each of these three Englishmen and the other British officers under them left a reputation behind them in Turkey of officers who never spared themselves, worked the fleet up to an improved state of efficiency, and were trusted and liked by the Turkish sailors. The *Messudieh* was the flagship of Admiral Limpus until he left Constantinople. When in the early days of December I had the pleasure of dining in Malta with the Admiral and his family, the great news which had come by Marconi was of the gallant deed done by our submarine, which, after waiting for her prey for eight hours under Nagara Point, had sunk the *Messudieh*.

It was during the period of Sir Philip Currie's ambassadorship that the following typical incident occurred. Said Pasha, commonly known from his short stature as Kutchuk Saïd (or little Saïd) had been Grand Vizier. He had previously been a Minister of State in another department, and had enjoyed the confidence of Abdul Hamid. But he had too much common sense not to recognise that the Sultan's methods of government were ruining the country, and there came a time when in its interest he could not yield to the Sultan's wishes. Thereupon Abdul took a strong dislike to him, and it became a matter of common observation that the Sultan wished to get rid of and to be revenged on him for his unwillingness to become his unreasoning agent. It was commonly said, indeed, that we should hear of his assassination. Abdul Hamid's spies had become reckless and dogged his footsteps through the streets of Stambul and Pera.

One day, accompanied by his son, a boy ten or twelve years old, Kutchuk Saïd observed the spies following him

more closely than usual. Accordingly he went into a well-known shop called the Bon Marché. The spies waited at the door till he should come out, but apparently overlooked the fact that there was another entrance which led into a street near the British Embassy. Thither with his young son Kutchuk Saïd fled, to Sir Philip Currie. He explained the situation, expressed the belief that the men at his heels were there to assassinate him, and claimed the protection of the Ambassador.

Sir Philip Currie was not the man under the circumstances to refuse it, nor was Lady Currie. The refugees were made welcome, and remained a few days as guests of the Ambassador. Lady Currie told me after they had gone that the poor man was evidently in a terrible state of alarm, and not only begged that his son might sleep in the same room with him, but that, although two beds were made up in one room, it was found that only one had been slept in.

Meantime the news had reached the palace that the fugitive had taken refuge at the British Embassy, and the Sultan sent a request to Sir Philip that he should be given up. Of course Sir Philip refused. He went, however, to see the Sultan, and he himself told me the story of his interview. The Sultan objected to his sheltering any Turkish subject, and asked for an explanation. "Then," said Sir Philip Currie, in telling the story, "a happy inspiration came into my mind." Remembering the Arab objection to giving up one who had eaten in your tent, he boldly informed the Sultan that it was contrary to the religion of Englishmen, "just as it is contrary to yours to surrender a fugitive who has entrusted his life to your care." The Sultan evidently felt that he could give no answer to such a statement. It was just one of those answers which appeals to the best sentiment and traditions in the Moslem mind. He professed that he had no intention of injuring him, and gave assurances that if he returned to his home nothing more would be said or done against him. Accordingly he returned home. In fact, his purpose had been answered by his being received at the British Embassy. It had made the fact public that the

refugee believed that he was to be assassinated by order of the Sultan, and his seeking refuge from such a fate made it highly unlikely that the wily Sultan would commit the act which he had probably premeditated.

Kutchuk Saïd died two or three years ago. The last time I saw him was on an interesting occasion. It was the day in 1909 on which the reigning sovereign, Murad V. Reshad, was girt with the sword of Osman. The ceremony took place in the mosque of Eyub. The mosque itself has no architectural pretensions, but is regarded by the pious Moslem with more veneration than any other in Constantinople. No unbeliever is permitted to enter it. Eyub or Job was the Standard Bearer of the Prophet, but was a much younger man, and greatly beloved by his master. He led in his old age in 670 a great army of Arabs and other Believers to the siege of Constantinople, and died there during that siege. When in 1453, nearly 800 years afterwards, the army of a second Mahomet, belonging, however, to the Ottoman race, besieged and captured the city, the body of Eyub was alleged to be found. Thereupon the mosque called after him was built over the grave, and at once acquired sanctity.

The favourite burying-place of Turks residing in Constantinople is around this mosque. I have myself been turned out even of the mosque yard, for every portion of it and of the building is holy ground. Hence, ever since the mosque has been built the ceremony corresponding to the coronation has taken place within its walls. The act of girding on the sword of Osman, the founder of the dynasty, belongs by right to the Superior, or, as he is called, the Chilibi, of the Mehlevhi Dervishes, who resides usually at Konia, the ancient Iconium. On such an occasion the Turks make a fine display.

Unaware that there would be any chance of my getting into the mosque, I had managed to be in a carriage with my daughter on a road in Stambul where the imperial cortège, consisting of the Sultan and all his Ministers, all profusely decorated, would pass. My daughter had taken with her a

kodak and had made some successful snaps. I left her in the carriage for a few minutes when, near the shore of the Golden Horn at Balata (the ancient Palatium) I saw an Admiralty boat, and to my surprise met Kutchuk Saïd. The Admiralty boat came alongside to receive him and I turned away so as not to lose sight of the carriage. To my surprise I heard my name called, and saw that Kutchuk Saïd had entered the boat and that it was he who was calling me. He took it for granted that I should enter it with him, and promised kindly to place me in a good position within the mosque for seeing the whole ceremony. I reluctantly had to explain that I could not leave my daughter alone, and I thus missed a chance of seeing a rare spectacle.

While on the subject of the coronation, I may mention a conversation that I had with my old friend Hamdi Bey, director of the Imperial Museum, in reference to a proposed picture connected with the ceremony. Hamdi exhibited for many years in succession at the Salon in Paris, and for two years in the Royal Academy in London. One of the pictures, called *Le jeune Emir à l'étude*, was purchased by the Liverpool Art Gallery. I believe I am the only man in Turkey whose portrait Hamdi Bey painted. He had many studies in hand for his contemplated picture when he died, about three years ago, for the picture in question was well adapted to his talent and an excellent subject for a painter. There existed a custom amongst the early Turks which has not altogether disappeared. After the Sultan had been girt with the imperial sword he was led out of the mosque, near a heap, presumably a rubbish heap, upon which lay the corpse of his predecessor covered with a sheet. As he passed it the Sheik-Ul-Islam raised the sheet and said in a loud voice, pointing to the corpse, "Padishah, as that thing is so wilt thou one day be. Be just and merciful." On my many visits to Hamdi I was always interested to see the studies which he had made for a picture representing the Sheik in his gorgeous cream-coloured robes raising the sheet.

Poor Hamdi, liked by all of us who knew him, had always an eye for the picturesque. When, mainly through the

influence, I believe, of Sir Arthur Evans, Mr. Hogarth, and Sir William Ramsay, the University of Oxford bestowed upon him the degree of D.C.L., that which most impressed him, he told me, was the artistic grouping at the conferring of degrees. He had forty decorations, and the degree conferred upon him at Oxford was, I understood, the one most highly valued.

While on the subject of Turkish sentiment, partly racial and partly religious, such as that to which I have alluded of protecting a refugee, I may tell a story which is generally believed, and *se non e vero* is certainly *ben trovato*, by which I mean that it is plausible and may have been true. A well-known family of Armenians in Constantinople is called Allaverdi, and the traditional explanation of the name is the following. Towards the end of the eighteenth century there were three brothers whose surname does not matter, because even to this hour outside Constantinople and other cities a surname is usually unknown. The three in question had become rich, and therefore excited the cupidity of the reigning Sultan. All such men, being Christians, were squeezed. The three were accordingly sent for to the palace. The eldest was asked how he had obtained his money. He replied truly enough that it was by commerce. This was at once declared to be impossible, and his property was confiscated. The second was brought in and asked the same question. He said that he was a banker, whereupon he was informed that money-lending was contrary to religion, and when it was mentioned that he had lent money to a Believer and charged interest upon it, he was ordered to be executed, and his property seized. The third brother was then brought into the room. "How did you acquire your property? I suppose in the same way as one of your brothers."

"No, your Majesty, I did not. *Allah verdi*. God gave it to me," and thereupon the Sultan remained silent, and the man was allowed to keep the property so acquired. The reply would seem to a non-Turkish Moslem to be inadequate unless he was aware of the curious reverential attitude

adopted by Moslems in respect of certain oaths and promises. The use of the word " God " is, however, curiously common, and would not lead a man unaccustomed to Eastern methods of speech to connect it with reverence. Such words as " Mashallah," " Inchallah," " Bismillah," and half a dozen others are on every Turkish tongue, and while occasionally they have very significant and serious meanings, they are constantly and lightly uttered.

For example, in Damascus I attended a fourth-rate exhibition of oriental magic, and as any trick came off successfully the audience shouted " Mashallah," by which they meant nothing more than clever or wonderful. " Inchallah " is on the lips not only of every Moslem, but of nearly every foreigner in Constantinople, with the simple signification of " May it be so." In their solemn moments the Turks will occasionally swear by the heads of their children, and in such case they are to be believed.

While Sir Philip Currie was Ambassador I made the acquaintance of Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury. I had met him at dinner at the Embassy and found that he was acquainted with my historical studies. These led to conversation on the Eastern Churches, when I found that he had a mission to the Orthodox Patriarch and was greatly interested in ecclesiastical antiquities. Accordingly the next day we went together to visit some of the sites which have special interest for ecclesiastics. One of the first objects to which I called his attention was a large baptismal font which had once been within the church of Saint Peter and Saint Mark, now converted into a mosque. Upon such conversion the font had been placed outside the church and had not been seriously damaged.

The Bishop informed me that he considered himself an expert in fonts, and that he had never seen one like this before. Like the fonts in all ancient Eastern churches, it was intended for immersion. In form it is a trefoil, and upon what one may call the stalk of the trefoil were steps leading down into the water. The whole had been made out of one solid block of marble. He took measurements and made a

careful sketch of it. Two other fonts, larger even than the one mentioned, are now to be found in the Museum gardens, of which one came from the neighbouring church of St. John the Baptist. They are cruciform, and in the centre was a stone stool on which the priest could stand without descending into the water.

We next visited a well between the walls of the city, over which was probably built an English church. I say "probably," because another site has been suggested. The story is a curious one, and the Bishop had not heard it before. He had heard of the Varangians, or as I prefer to call them, the Warings, and of the Waring Guard which had been attached to the palace near which was the font and the well in question as early as 945. These Warings formed a trusted bodyguard for the Emperor from that date until 1204. A Russian monk tells us that while the Warings came from Russia by the Black Sea, their regiment was constantly recruited in Constantinople by their countrymen, but that, after the conquest of England by William the Norman in 1066, a band of Englishmen sailed out to Constantinople and founded a church which they dedicated to Saint Augustine of Canterbury. The best account of their voyage is given, however, in an Icelandic saga, a translation of which was given in the *English Historical Review* (about 1880). Dr. A. van Millingen favours the opinion that St. Augustine's church was the one mentioned over the well. The late Canon Curtis, who took an interest in the question, believed that the church was half a mile distant, at Bogdan Serai, the ruins of which were destroyed as recently as 1913. The subject of the Warings is of peculiar interest, because the English from that time acquired a reputation for love of justice which they have never lost in the East.

Bishop Wordsworth, on his return to England, wrote an interesting and valuable pamphlet on his visit to the Eastern churches.

A few words must be said about Lady Currie. The Ambassador's wife in Constantinople is almost necessarily an important personage. As there is no court in the European

sense, the Turkish ladies of course never taking part in assemblies where men are present, each Embassy is a centre of society, not merely for those who belong to the same nationality as the Ambassador, but for members of all the other Embassies and Legations, and the principal European families residing in Pera. The wives of the British Ambassadors have generally, though not always, shone conspicuously in these functions. Very often, indeed, the wives of the Secretaries have added *éclat* to the semi-public functions of the Embassies, and I would willingly mention two or three by name who have shone brilliantly, but for the impertinence of bringing in their names and the unwillingness to hurt the feelings of others whose names I should omit. As a centre of social life Lady Currie was a success, and was especially beloved by ladies of the British community.

As the writer of a really remarkable drama on Queen Mary and other contributions to literature, she brought with her a reputation to Constantinople. She had an exceptional knowledge of English literature, and in London, before her marriage to Sir Philip, had been the centre of a group of literary and dramatic men and women, which gave her gatherings great interest to us in Constantinople. Few things were more charming than the long talks we had together on literary men and things. She would say, in her delightful manner, "Let us drop all these questions about Constantinople and get into a brighter atmosphere. Have you read ——'s book?" Or she would lead the conversation into an artistic or literary channel. Had she lived in the reign of Louis XIV. she would have been the lady of a *salon* which would have been the gathering-place of artists and literary men, and the *élite* of the intellect of Paris. Her lot, however, was cast for the time in Constantinople, where, though she never complained, I feel sure that she was bored by her entourage. She was always ready at the same time to do what she could for the poorer members of the British community, and took great interest in our English High School for Girls.

She and her husband continued till the end to be greatly in love with each other. If, as rumour stated, the marriage was due to the pressing request of Queen Victoria, my only observation is that such interference was one more of the kindly acts attributed to the Queen, whose relations with her large family were a model to her subjects.

It was at one of her receptions that an incident occurred which I feel bound to narrate, because it has already got into print in a not quite correct form. Going one afternoon to one of Lady Currie's public receptions, after a few words to the hostess a man came up to me, asked me how I was, and made some quite unimportant remarks. Thereupon a Secretary of the Embassy, who of course knew me, came across the room and asked did I know that man. I replied that I knew him by name and had seen him twice before. Did I know what he was? My reply was that I had heard rumours about him as to the truth of which I knew nothing whatever.

"Then," said he, "I am going to tell you who and what he is. He is a spy in the service of Abdul Hamid."

I expressed my doubts.

"Wait until you have heard my story. Last week he invited a correspondent of the *Standard* to dinner for Monday to meet some members of the Young Turk Party."

My answer was, "This is interesting, because, curiously enough, he invited me to dinner on the same evening and held out the same inducement."

Said the Secretary, "Oh, that would have been grand for him if he could have got the correspondent of the *Standard* and you of the *Daily News* to dine with him. Why didn't you go?"

"How do you know I didn't go?"

"You will see directly how I know. Why didn't you go?"

"Well, since you press me, I will tell you. I considered the invitation to dine with a man, although an Englishman, of whom I knew nothing, in order to meet Young Turks, as

an impertinence, and therefore wrote declining and pleaded a previous engagement. It is not prudent in these times to meet members of the Young Turkey Party unless you know who they are and who else you are going to meet."

The Secretary answered, "You were wise. The correspondent of the *Standard* accepted and went. At the dinner were two Young Turks, who are my friends and whom you know," one of them being still a distinguished Turkish soldier. They spoke freely at the dinner and then their host wrote a report to the palace of the conversation which had taken place. This report, by good luck, fell into the hands of one of the Sultan's Chief Secretaries, who was a friend of one of the Young Turks who had been present at the dinner. When he read the report he became greatly alarmed, because he recognised that if it went in to the Sultan the Young Turk in question would be exiled at least, if not worse treated. Accordingly he sent for the two Young Turks to the palace and shewed them the report. He pointed out the gravity of the statements in it and the probable consequences. At the same time he intimated that he had his own position to consider. He would be dismissed to a certainty, or perhaps worse, if he did not present the report. After talking over the matter with them for some time a brilliant idea struck him. "You two draw up a report of the dinner and mention what the Englishman (the spy) said." This they did. The Secretary, after reading their report, approved it. "This will do very well. Do not come to see me to-morrow, but be about the palace so that if I want you you can be found."

Thereupon the Secretary sent for the Englishman who had given the dinner, and shewed him the report of the two Young Turks. When he read it he remarked, "But this is a mass of lies." The Secretary answered, "That does not concern me. My duty is to pass in both reports, and leave His Majesty to decide." Then, however, he hinted that if the report of the two Young Turks got into His Majesty's hands he would cease to receive the large monthly pay which he had been getting. The Englishman became

alarmed. He recognised that the story of two Turks was likely to be believed in preference to his own, and begged the Secretary to shew him a way out of the difficulty. The Secretary, after some hesitation, said that if he could find the Young Turks perhaps they might agree to withdraw their report on condition of the Englishman also taking his back, but that there was a danger to him personally, because if it became known that he had been party to the suppression of a report the consequences might be of the gravest. However, he called a messenger and asked him to look about the palace and see whether the two Young Turks in question were there. Without very much difficulty they were found, and the Secretary in presence of the Englishman gave a little informal address to them both. If the Englishman's report went in it might be unpleasant for his two Turkish friends; if theirs went in the Englishman would certainly lose his appointment. But he was most anxious for his own position. After talking it over it was agreed that each should take back his report and give his word of honour that he would refuse to admit that he had ever made one. This course was agreed upon.

This was the story told to me in Lady Currie's drawing-room, and I thought I had heard the last of it. A few days later, however—it was in the depth of our short but miserable winter, with any amount of slush in the streets—a carriage drew up to my door, and X., the correspondent of the *Standard*, appeared. It turned out that the day after the dinner he had gone out shooting and had only returned that morning. On reaching the city someone had informed him of the story, because my informant the Secretary of the Embassy and other people connected with the Embassy spoke openly of the incident. My friend, as soon as he heard, did the right thing, and went to see Sir Philip Currie. The Ambassador gave him a version of the incident which corresponded exactly with that which I had received.

Thereupon X. had driven from the Embassy to the Englishman's house, had seen him and had told him the story that he had heard from Sir Philip Currie, adding also

that he had learned that I had been invited to the same dinner. The Englishman admitted that I had been invited but had declined, and then flatly denied that he had written any report whatever. He professed great indignation that such a story should be set about, and asked what he ought to do. The reply of the correspondent was pat, "I am not telling you of an idle rumour, but of what Her Majesty's representative says of you. Your duty is clear. Go at once to see him and tell him what you have told me. If you do not you will never be allowed to put your foot in the Embassy again," and he added that he had learned that that incident was now common talk and that in the club to which he had obtained an introduction, some young men, none of whom was an Englishman, had pledged themselves that if he went inside they would take him by the hands and feet and deposit him in the thickest of the slush in Pera. "You have no need to ask me what your duty is." It is sufficient if I add that though the Englishman in question continued in the service of the Sultan for a few years longer, until he was expelled by virtue of a very useful provision in the English Order in Council, he never again put his foot in the Embassy or the club in question.

Espionage was indeed in full swing. At first it was mostly confined to Turkish subjects, but the numbers of reports of spies had constantly mentioned foreign subjects and the Sultan became obsessed with the idea that foreigners, as well as a large section of his own people, were conspiring against him. I need hardly remark that in any community there are men and women who are prepared to sell their souls against cash payment. I could tell many incidents of great inconvenience occasioned to foreign subjects by spies. I mention one more case as illustrative of what was pretty common. The largest hotel in Pera was and is the Pera Palace. An English visitor having business in Turkey, but one who took little interest in the politics of the country, had resided for some time at that hotel. Probably in conversation with other visitors he spoke freely of the misgovernment existing in the country. He soon observed

however, that there was a lady in the hotel who, when in the dining-room and in the general saloon, always tried to get as near to him as possible and was evidently listening to his conversation. He became annoyed and ordered the waiter to place his seat at another table. The lady gave similar orders. He did not know her nor wish to know her, for her movements led him to believe that she was a spy.

On one occasion when she could not get near enough to hear his conversation, she placed herself at an angle to the looking-glass where she could follow his every movement. In the hotel it soon became reputed that the lady was a spy, and my friend boldly went to the manager of the hotel, who admitted the character attributed to her. He declared that he would send her away if the visitor insisted, "but," he added, "if I do, we shall have to take in another the next day." Then, becoming confidential, he stated that she only paid three francs a day, the usual price being twenty-two francs, and the difference being paid by the Government. The lady becoming even more annoying after this incident, the visitor in question was driven to speaking to her, and in the conversation told her that she was believed to be a spy, employing the word itself. I had met her on two or three occasions and had learnt that the American Consul-General was in doubt as to the validity of her passport. I knew also that she had become known to the British Consul and represented herself as persecuted by the British visitors.

On a certain Sunday the Englishman came to my house and informed me that he had told the woman she was a spy and that he would not be troubled by her. Almost immediately after him came the lady herself, in a condition of burning indignation. I knew the repute that she bore, I knew also that the American Consul looked upon her with great distrust, and that she was living at the most expensive hotel on three francs a day. She told me her story, wished to take proceedings for verbal slander against the Englishman, and wished to retain me. I spoke very plainly to her. Such an action would have to be tried before a British jury. There was not a member of the British colony, or indeed of any

foreign colony in Constantinople, who did not loathe the occupation of a spy, and from what I knew of the Englishman I was sure that he would plead that the statement was true, and that it was in the interests of the public that it should be known that she was a spy. She used all her powers of persuasion to induce me to take up her case, which I had told her from the first I could not and would not do, and left the house, apparently satisfied with my explanation and telling her friends she could not bring the action because I was her enemy.

In dismissing her, I can only say that everybody concerned, except one weak-minded official, whom a plausible woman could usually bring over to her side, was glad to hear the statement that if she brought her action justification would be pleaded and proved. She continued her mischievous career until the Revolution of 1908, and then disappeared from Constantinople.

Some two years afterwards I had a visit from the Rev. Mr. Brown, the head of the Oxford Mission in Calcutta, a mission intended specially to appeal to the young University men of our Empire. I believe that he had twenty Oxford or Cambridge men under him, and that the mission was of a quite exceptional character, both on account of the scholarship possessed by his staff and of the character of the work it was doing. His visit fell on Whit Sunday, old style. After lunch we went for a walk in Stambul to see some of the less well known archæological objects in the vicinity of the Hippodrome. As we passed near the Armenian cathedral at Kum Kapou I mentioned the fact and suggested that we should call upon the Armenian Patriarch, who was an old friend. Mr. Brown at once said that there was nothing he would like better for that Sunday afternoon. I did not know that on that day there was a service in the church peculiar to the Armenians; but when we reached the building and I enquired for the Patriarch, the priest, who knew me, said that he was certain the Patriarch would be pleased with my visit, and almost before we knew where we were going we were led into the building by a door in the

east end. We saw at once that it was crowded with men, who closed round us and almost forced us towards the Patriarch. His throne faced the altar, and near to him, also on a daïs but a step lower than his, was his chaplain, who, seeing us, as did His Holiness, vacated his seat, and we two were seated beside the Patriarch, somewhat, I think, to the astonishment of the congregation.

The ceremony and the singing went on uninterruptedly, and the Patriarch, after expressing his astonishment at my visiting him there, at once added that I could not have come on a more interesting occasion. The ceremony which was in progress was only to be seen in the Armenian Church, and was celebrated annually on their Whit Sunday. After I had introduced Mr. Brown as a clergyman of our Church and from Calcutta, where there are a great number of Armenians, the Patriarch gave an explanation in French of the ceremony as it proceeded. The altar immediately in front of us, at the distance of about thirty feet, had a screen in the form of a semi-circle before it, which represented a walled city. After a long hymn a procession of priests went before the screen and knocked ceremoniously three times, asking for admittance. It was refused after two demands. After the third the enquiry was made from the other side of the screen for whom admittance was demanded. The answer was, "The Lord of Hosts." Then the screen fell down and we saw the altar fully illuminated and with all its sacred vessels. The brilliant display was followed by a hymn of triumph, every incident being eagerly watched by a packed congregation.

After that the Patriarch said to us, "I have to preach, but shall not be more than ten minutes. Don't go away, because I want to have a long talk with you." Thereupon he was conducted from his throne to the platform, about three feet high, on which the altar was placed, and there delivered a stirring address. Though neither of us could understand a word of Armenian, we yet recognised the power of an orator. The day was very hot. The robes of a Patriarch are very heavy, and we saw that the physical exertion was necessarily

great. The service concluded a few minutes after the Patriarch's address and he at once was conducted outside the church by the door at which we had entered. He had left word, however, that we in passing out were to wait for him at his official residence.

We both thought that the kindest thing to do was simply to leave our cards and not bother him, but at the gate we found that he had left so earnest a message that we went into his private room, where, after he had had time to get out of his heavy robes, he joined us. After learning all that he could of the condition of the Armenians in Calcutta, and giving my friend particulars of the massacres that had occurred round the building where we then were, he declared that he did not believe there was a man in the congregation who had not lost either a relation or a friend, that each victim could have saved his life had he been willing to raise his two fingers and abandon his faith, but that he was proud to say he did not believe that in Constantinople any had saved their lives by such apostasy.

CHAPTER XIV

SIR NICHOLAS O'CONOR

Sir Nicholas O'Conor at Constantinople—Our Meeting at Sofia—Stambuloff Sends For Me—My Lost Luggage—I Enter the Palace Looking Like a Brigand—Stambuloff Comes to See Me Off—The State of Macedonia—Robber Chiefs as Protectors—Exodus of the Inhabitants—Hilmi Pasha's Reforms Shelved—The Rival Churches—An Appeal to Rome—The Eternal Question of Reform—Formation of a Revolutionary Party—Dr. Nazim's Adventures.

SIR PHILIP CURRIE was succeeded in 1898 as Ambassador by Sir Nicholas Roderick O'Conor. It was when dining with him and Mrs. O'Conor (Sir Nicholas was not then knighted) years previously at Sofia, that I received an invitation which led to my first important interview with Stambuloff, the stern patriot-premier of Bulgaria, and that under very curious circumstances. I was fairly well acquainted with several of the Bulgarian Ministers, some of whom I had known even before the establishment of Bulgaria, and for one of whom I had worked in conjunction with Mr. Schuyler to save him from being hanged as a Turkish rebel. On the occasion of the first anniversary of Prince Ferdinand's accession to the throne, I arranged to pay a visit to Sofia. There was to be a great review. The princely palace was for the first time to be lighted by electricity, and there was to be a ball at which everybody of note in Sofia was to be present.

I had been spending a holiday in Switzerland. The weather was hot and dusty, and at that time there was no Orient Express and no sleeping-cars on the train. In

consequence I travelled in an old suit with an old white wide-awake hat, intending, of course, when I reached Sofia, to change. As the train passed through Hungary the conductor requested all passengers to examine the numbers of their registered luggage tickets, and to see whether a certain number which he mentioned was on them. I found that the number wanted was on my ticket, and the conductor then regretted to say that my luggage had been left behind somewhere. As to the whereabouts he could give me no information. Accordingly I left the train at Sofia with nothing but the suit in which I stood and a small handbag containing the necessaries for a night.

I went to the best hotel, practically the only one in Sofia, and secured a bed. Then I paid a call on the British Agent, Mr. (afterwards Sir Nicholas) O'Connor. I had not met either him or his wife, but I think we took a liking to each other from the first, one which I am happy to say continued until his death. He asked me to dinner. I pointed to my disreputable looking clothes and asked how I could possibly come to dinner in that fashion. He replied that he would keep me company and would not dress. Accordingly I went to dinner in the evening, passing the palace, which in a blaze of electric light was an astonishment to all the natives. In addition to Mrs. O'Connor there was only one other guest, whose name I have forgotten.

At ten o'clock Mr. O'Connor went off with the visitor on a matter of business which he declared would not keep him more than a quarter of an hour, and Mrs. O'Connor and I sat out on the balcony under the lovely moonlight of a table-land 2,300 feet above sea-level, and conversed on many interesting topics. Ten minutes after her husband had left we saw an *aide-de-camp* drive up at full gallop after Russian fashion, which the Bulgarians at that time always followed. He was asked to come forward and then stated that he came with M. Stambuloff's compliments to me, to say that he had only just heard that I was in Sofia and begged me to go round to the palace to see him. I pointed to my clothes and asked the *aide* to say that I had arrived that morning but had lost



Photo.

SIR NICHOLAS R. O'CONNOR

L. Lott & Co., Ltd.



my luggage, and that, as he would see, I was in no condition to present myself at the palace, but that I should be glad to call upon M. Stambuloff in the morning.

The A.D.C. drove off at the same pace at which he had arrived, and ten minutes later returned with a message that M. Stambuloff wished to see me and not my clothes, and that he would take it as a great favour if I would return with the *aide-de-camp*. I hesitated as to my action, but Mrs. O'Connor, speaking in English, which we had learned that the A.D.C. did not understand, suggested that I should go, because at that time, the relations between England and Bulgaria being strained, the Prince not being yet recognised by England, if I did not go it would be thought it was the influence of Mr. O'Connor which prevented me from doing so. Once that suggestion was made I immediately decided to return with the A.D.C.

In a few minutes we were at the palace, and as I entered the large hall, M. Stoiloff, already a Minister and subsequently Premier, and three or four more of the Ministers to whom I was known, came forward to express their satisfaction at seeing me in Sofia. While we were shaking hands, M. Stambuloff came from an inner room to express satisfaction that I had come, and I repeated my excuse that I was not presentable. He took me by the arm, and we went at once through a suite of three or four rooms in which, during the interval of dancing, a great many men and women were either seated around or were promenading. They saw their Premier, to their astonishment, arm-in-arm with a man looking as much like a brigand as could be seen in any of the Balkans, carrying in his hand a broad-brimmed wide-awake.

We passed through into the garden, which was also brilliantly lighted, and walked up and down a side path until about a quarter past twelve. During this time many couples intentionally passed our way to see if they could recognise who the brigand was to whom the Premier was talking. However, we were each interested in the other's conversation until the time just mentioned, but we both felt that the night was getting chilly and I suggested that we should adjourn

the conversation. This we agreed to do until the morning. Nothing special passed in our morning interview, and in the afternoon I renewed my journey to Constantinople.

A friend of mine, Baron Hanley, had an interview with the King on the day I left, who remarked to him, "I am told that Mr. Pears arrived yesterday in Sofia and leaves this afternoon. He *says* that he lost his luggage." Hanley, in telling the story, remarked that from the way in which the King made the statement he might have added, "That story will do for the marines." As a fact, I only recovered my luggage three months later. It had apparently been left at a wayside station on entering Hungary.

The latest meeting and most interesting conversation I had with M. Stambuloff was a few years later. I think it was in 1892. I had received the honour of an invitation to dine with Prince (now King) Ferdinand at Philippopolis, where he had gone to open a local exhibition. I was accompanied by an old and very dear friend, Dr. Long of Robert College. M. Stambuloff was still Prime Minister and with some other Ministers was also a guest at the dinner, but I had little opportunity of conversing with him. Dr. Long and I had arranged to return next day to Constantinople. We went to the railway station, which is about half a mile from the town, giving ourselves half an hour's grace, sat down at a table on the platform which was crowded with people waiting for the great event of the day, the arrival of the train, when to our surprise we saw a carriage driving towards the station accompanied by a guard of soldiers. Two minutes afterwards M. Stambuloff, accompanied by the station-master, came up to say that he had come to see us off. The train, we had already learnt, was half an hour late. The crowd naturally pressed round to see Stambuloff, but he took a seat at our table and the station-master cleared a large space to prevent us being interrupted or heard.

I shall never forget the conversation which ensued. It was addressed largely to me, because though he knew my friend well by name, the latter was not aware that he had ever seen him before. I had long been a privileged person

with the Bulgarians, who were and are very grateful for the services which I had rendered in 1876-78. I mention this fact only to explain the freedom with which Stambuloff allowed me to speak to him. His own newspaper had been attacking the Czar in a quite outrageous manner. I told him that I thought this was a mistake on his part ; that while he was naturally and justly irritated at the conduct of the Russian diplomatists, who were trying to treat Bulgaria as if she were a Russian province, it was neither right nor expedient to make personal attacks on the Emperor and his family. I enlarged on this, insisting that whether the statements were true or not it was unwise to make them.

Stambuloff took it very well, but his reply was substantially this, " I know Russia better than you do, and when you are dealing with a Russian you must use the biggest stick or the best weapon that comes to your hands. You must hit everywhere and all round." I differed, and we discussed the question fully in a friendly manner. When, not long afterwards, Stambuloff was brutally murdered, I felt that my remarks had been terribly justified.

Our subsequent conversation turned on missionaries. Stambuloff said to my friend, " You don't remember me, Dr. Long, I see." " No," was the reply, " I don't think I have had the honour of seeing you before." " It may be so, but when you were a missionary in Tirnovo I saw and often heard you there. In your small congregation I was, like all boys of the country, clothed in *shiac* (the native cloth), and went to hear you under these circumstances. The talk in the town was that an American had come to it and was trying to bewitch the people and turn them away from their church. They said that if people attended his services a spell would be cast over them ; they would gradually wither away ; and all sorts of like rubbish was said about you. I was about fourteen or fifteen at the time, and thought I should like to see this monster. I reflected that he could not eat me, and I did not believe that he could cast any spell over me. So I quietly attended your service, and went home declaring that all you had said was good, common sense,

that there was not a word against the Orthodox Church, or against any other institution or person ; and what you said was so interesting that I went again at least half a dozen times.

“ Now, I know that you are no longer a missionary, but you will be interested when I tell you that since I have been a Bulgarian Minister, and especially since I became Premier, I have always looked with sympathy on the work of the American missionaries. They are invaluable promoters of civilisation. I especially value the grand work which Robert College has done for our nation, and since I have been Premier, whenever I have had complaints made against American missionaries, I have mentally remarked, ‘ This is the old rubbish which I used to hear as a boy. These men are doing the work of civilisation and I am going to protect them.’ All my personal influence in favour of American missions is due to you, Dr. Long.”

Stambuloff on this occasion spoke fully of the way he had cleared the region near to and south of Burgas of brigands. The district was mostly covered with forest, and being adjacent to Turkey, the brigands crossed the boundary when chased by Bulgarian police. For a while no respectable person dared enter it. But through his energetic measures, stern and unflinching execution of judicial sentences, it had again become habitable. The train was upwards of half an hour late and Stambuloff waited till it came, always interested and interesting, and then we said good-bye.

Ever since the Congress of Berlin in 1878 the condition of Macedonia had forced itself upon European attention. But public opinion was weary of the reports of Turkish outrages, especially in Armenia, and British newspapers did not care to trouble their readers with recounting new horrors in Europe. The condition of Macedonia, moreover, was such as to a considerable extent to divide English opinion, inasmuch as Bulgarians attributed the condition of unrest to the intrigues of the Greeks, while the latter were quite certain that they were due to the interference of the Bulgars. The

leading Ministers in Turkey were divided in their advice ; some mistook intrigue for statesmanship, others blindly did what they believed would be pleasing to the Sultan, and not even in Austria was the maxim *Divide et impera* more fully acted upon than by Abdul Hamid. Turkish soldiers were stationed throughout the whole of Macedonia, and reflected the wavering counsels of the Government.

The facts that we knew in Constantinople were the following : that no security for life and property existed ; that Turkish soldiers constantly plundered Bulgarian and occasionally Greek villages ; that bands of brigands, sometimes wearing the uniform of Greek and sometimes of Bulgarian soldiers, continued to devastate the country ; that in some places a group of villages would place themselves under the protection of a robber chief, would contribute to his support and would be attacked by Greek robbers, the Turkish troops now favouring one and at another time the other party ; that thousands of Macedonians fled the country and took refuge in Bulgaria or Serbia. Between them and the Bulgarians in particular there was naturally great sympathy, and often close family relationship. The Turkish authorities, instead of protecting villages which were attacked, exacted from all of them as much money as possible, now protecting the bands of Bulgarian sympathisers, but usually favouring the Greeks. National feeling ran high. A brave Greek officer was killed and I possess a post-card, naturally in Greek, commemorative of his virtues and finishing with the words, "Death to every Bulgar." Murder was common. Our Foreign Office must contain dozens of reports sent from various places in Macedonia describing the pandemonium amidst which the writers lived.

Such was the condition in Macedonia when Sir Nicholas O'Connor came to the capital. He was always careful not to take the side either of the Bulgarians or of the Greeks, but what he did care for and worked hard to obtain was security for life and property, and even-handed justice. The Porte was urged to execute reforms. England and France in particular pointed out in very strenuous terms that

Macedonia would be lost to Turkey if such reforms were not adopted. Amid much exultation, Hilmi Pasha was sent on behalf of the Sultan to report on the condition and to suggest what reforms were necessary. Hilmi had honestly made a good reputation, and European well-wishers to Turkey believed that his recommendations would be truthful and hoped they would be followed by the Porte.

The Ambassadors urged with justice that recommendations made by a Turkish Pasha, the nominee of the Sultan, would be much more likely to be attended to than any of the projects put forward by the representatives of the Powers. Hilmi, so far as we foreigners could see, did very little, and we suspected that it was because his recommendations were not attended to. In a conversation with the Grand Vizier, who had been his colleague for a time, the latter, however, assured me that Hilmi's reports and recommendations were of the most practical character, but that Abdul Hamid would have none of them. They were never allowed to be published, but my informant, who had seen them, declared that they were more drastic in their thoroughness than any which the Powers had proposed.

With his miserable ideas of statesmanship, Abdul Hamid would do nothing but play off Greeks against Bulgars. He probably considered it very satisfactory that they were fighting and intriguing against each other, and nothing would induce him to remove the bone of contention. Every year saw the condition of Macedonia becoming worse, the number of emigrants into Bulgaria steadily increasing, the struggles between the Bulgarian and Greek bands becoming fiercer. As in Bulgaria, twenty-five years earlier, the Turks arrested, imprisoned, tortured, or hanged school teachers and the leading members of the community by preference.

The struggle was embittered by the differences which existed among the population owing to their attachment to the Patriarch of Constantinople or to the Bulgarian Exarch. Many of the churches and schools in the country had been built by the subscriptions of the inhabitants before the separation of the Bulgarian Church from the Patriarchate.

To understand this, a short explanation is necessary. The Orthodox Church, represented by the Patriarch of Constantinople, employed the Greek language as continuously as the Roman Catholic Church has employed Latin. All Orthodox Churches in the Balkan Peninsula were at one time under his jurisdiction.

In the terrible disorder in the Orthodox Church consequent upon the capture of Constantinople in 1453, the ancient ecclesiastical organisation largely broke down, and all the power which it possessed became centred in the Patriarchate at Constantinople. The appointment of Bishops and the filling of other ecclesiastical offices were in its hands. The Patriarchs themselves often had to pay heavily in order to obtain their offices, such payments being made to influential Turkish Pashas. In return the Turkish Pashas supported the Patriarchate in its claim to appoint Bishops throughout the Peninsula, and these Bishops had to pay for their appointments and to contribute to the Patriarchate. The whole ecclesiastical system became singularly corrupt, and it is to the infinite credit of the Orthodox Church that by its own inherent vitality it has largely swept away such corruption. The wishes of the laity were entirely disregarded unless they were prepared to outbid the price which their proposed nominee would pay. All the Bishops in Bulgaria and Macedonia were Greeks, very often men who knew nothing of the language of the people.

To such an extent did this prevail that a distinguished member of the House of Lords, still happily amongst us, informed me that when he followed Kinglake after the *Eothen* journey from Belgrade through Sofia and Philippopolis to Constantinople previous to the Crimean war, he recognised from the crosses on the churches that they were intended for Christian worship, but concluded that the inhabitants, when Christian, were all Greeks. He heard Greek spoken at various places where he put up, probably at Bishops' houses, but heard nothing about Bulgarians. Readers of *Eothen* will be surprised to see how little is said of the Bulgars. Meantime, however, a great movement had

spread in Bulgaria as early as the 'sixties of last century, claiming that their Church service should be in the Slavic language.

The Bulgarian people generally had ceased to regard their Church as a protector. Its liturgy was Greek, its government foreign. The progressive spirits claimed not only that the language should be Slavic, but that the Bishops sent by the Patriarch should speak Bulgarian. I remember a story told by an old German consul who had been stationed in Bulgaria in the 'sixties. A heated quarrel took place in a Bulgarian Church meeting when one of the speakers attacked the Bishop on this very ground. "You," said he, addressing the Bishop, "have been here four years. You don't speak a word of our language. There is a young American who has only been in the town five or six months and who is already beginning to address people in Bulgarian."

The struggle over the language question between the Bulgarians, which includes the people of Macedonia for this purpose, and the Patriarchate became fierce, and the Russian Church naturally sympathised with those who desired to employ the Slavic liturgy. But Russia refused to interfere, fearing to make a division in the Orthodox Church. It was only in 1861, when an important section of the population sent a deputation to Rome proposing that Rome should recognise the Bulgarian Church which would become uniate, that the Russian Government, to prevent such a result, interfered. England and France were drawn into the struggle and recognised that the only reasonable solution was that the Bulgarians should have their own Church.

The Porte, always ready to act on the principle of *divide et impera*, granted a firman in 1870 constituting a Bulgarian Church. Its authority was to extend over all Bulgarian-speaking communities in the empire. Its head was to be called the Exarch. Monsignor Joseph was appointed, and occupied that position until his death in 1915. I knew him during thirty years as one greatly respected by the Bulgarian people and at every Embassy in Constantinople. No better selection could have been made. Owing

to accidental circumstances I rarely saw him during the last eight or nine years. The last time I did so was when, in company with Sir Nicholas O'Conor, who liked and respected him, I paid him a visit at Prinkipo.

The Orthodox Church declared the Bulgarians in schism and still so regards them. Once such a decision was pronounced there immediately began a series of quarrels as to the possession of the churches built in various parts of European Turkey for worshippers belonging to the Orthodox Church, some of whom proposed to adhere to the Patriarchate, while the majority desired to have the service in the Slavic tongue and therefore came under the Bulgarian Exarch. It was in Macedonia in particular, where the population was mixed, that these differences were most acute, and the bands of robbers, Greeks and Bulgars, fought for the possession of the churches with as much fierceness as ever did Roman Catholics and Protestants during the Thirty Years' War in Germany. When the question was taken before the Law Courts the decision was usually in favour of the Patriarchate, that is of the Greeks, and this for the technical reason that the title deeds or firmans authorising the Church had been given in the name of the Patriarchate at Constantinople.

The great difficulty in apportioning the buildings arose from the manner in which Greeks and Bulgarians, especially in Southern Macedonia, were mixed together. In many villages the two races, each speaking its own language, lived apart, but without much quarrelling. In addition, and in the same neighbourhood, there would be Greek and Bulgarian villages within a short distance of each other, and of course when a question of nationality arose each village took part.

The dispersion and isolation of the various races throughout the Balkan Peninsula is a puzzling factor. Until seventy years ago there was a Slav village within five miles of Athens. In 1878, when I visited General Skobelev in his camp at Derwent, about twenty miles from Constantinople,

there were two villages, almost adjoining, the ruins of both of which I saw, one Bulgarian and one Greek. In other parts of Thrace there were many Bulgarian villages. I was concerned professionally in advising as to the ownership of land on the actual shores of the Marmara, where many of the inhabitants were Bulgars, though the majority were Greek. This dispersed condition of the population gave point to a grim joke of General Ignatief when a line between Turkey and the Greater Bulgaria had to be drawn in the San Stefano Treaty. In reply to the statement of the Turkish Delegates as to where the boundary should be marked, the General said, "I will take it where you yourselves have drawn it." There was a look of astonishment and enquiry. The General pointed to the large maps before them and indicated Bulgarian villages which had been burnt quite near the capital. Clearly that line could not be thus drawn.

The troubles in Macedonia due to the misgovernment of Turkey were rapidly bringing it to ruin. As already mentioned, thousands had emigrated into Bulgaria, but in addition there was a steady movement of emigration to America. Trustworthy statistics do not exist, but I gathered from certain consular reports that, in 1904, 3,000 men were believed to have crossed the Atlantic from the vilayet of Monastir alone; that in the following year 7,000 had gone; in the first half of 1906 the number had increased to nearly 15,000. In ten of the villages around Florina it was reported that only women and children remained. I called the attention of the British public at the time to this emigration. A bright young Frenchman, who unhappily died in Constantinople of fever some two years ago, M. Gaulis, took up the matter very bravely in his French correspondence and was supported heartily by M. Victor Bérard, who described Macedonia as "a country of pillage and massacres, producing nothing for its inhabitants, and useless for the rest of the world, uninhabitable for the natives and impenetrable for foreigners." Even among the Moslems there was widespread dissatis-

faction, which even they recognised as being due to the senseless government of Abdul Hamid.

At the Berlin Congress of 1878 Europe had recognised that something ought to be done. A mixed Commission was formed by it to draw up a scheme of reforms for European Turkey. The British Commissioner was Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice. Its work was done very thoroughly, and I have reason to believe that the thoroughness was largely due to the British Commissioner. But by the time it was finished the Sultan had come to disregard the recommendations of Berlin, and treated the report as waste paper. The only observation of note which I remember in connection with it was under the following circumstances. I had carefully read the report, and in conversation with Mr. Goschen, who was then Ambassador, remarked that I thought it excellent. He replied that it was, but it was too good, that Abdul Hamid in his then frame of mind would not endeavour to carry out any of its recommendations.

The physical situation of Macedonia made it impossible that the people should submit willingly to Abdul Hamid's stupid tyranny. The neighbours of the disaffected districts were Bulgarians, Serbians, or Greeks, each of whom, with the assistance of Russia and other European Powers, had obtained their freedom. Free Greece, free Bulgaria, and free Serbia sympathised with their brethren who were still under the yoke. The small body of intelligent Turks who had eyes to see what was going on were meantime on the alert, and saw that Turkish rule would be lost unless reforms were introduced. A committee had already been formed of disaffected subjects of Turkey, mostly Moslems, but including also Armenians and other refugees. Its headquarters were in Paris, but there were members of it in Geneva. They were joined from time to time by intelligent Turks in Constantinople who were under suspicion of Abdul, and who loathed the system of espionage to which they were subject. Some of these Turks managed to escape from Turkey. I use the word escape because under the system of surveillance which Abdul Hamid instituted, not only were Armenians

forbidden even to go from one town or village in the empire to another without a local passport, but Turks were under a similar disability, and no one who was suspected of disloyalty ever had the chance of obtaining a passport. I remember that in the early years of the ambassadorship of Sir N. O'Connor, the Armenian Patriarch was very ill and was advised to take a course at a German bath. The Sultan sent his own doctor to him, professed warm friendship, and declared he could not let him go, but urged him to make use of baths in the neighbourhood of Constantinople.

In spite of the hindrances placed in the way of any subject proposing to leave Turkey, many influential men got away. Two instances occurred within my knowledge. A highly-placed Turkish family living on the Bosphorus made arrangements with the agent of a British steamer which contrived to arrive from the Black Sea just before sunset, and received permission to pass down the Bosphorus. When about half-way down a boat shot out into the stream and glided alongside. Its passengers climbed on board, it then being dusk, and the occupants next day were outside Turkey and on their way to France to join the enemies of Abdul Hamid.

A still more striking instance was that of Mahmud Damat, "Damat" implying that the person in question has married a member of the imperial family, usually, as in the present case, a sister of the Sultan. Mahmud and his two sons were missed one day, and it was not discovered until many days afterwards that they had escaped from Turkey. They had taken refuge on board a French steamer which was actually moored alongside the Galata quays, and remained there until a large Messagerie steamer transhipped them and took them to Marseilles. The incident created much sensation, because it soon became known that Mahmud's wife, using the liberty of speech always freely accorded to Turkish women, charged her brother the Sultan with having deprived her of her husband and her sons. As a fact they had reached Paris, and, without taking a very active part in opposition to the Sultan, let it be seen by their conduct that they had no confidence in him. The Sultan sent his favourite

emissary, who was to make many promises and hold out all sorts of inducements to them to return. But all in vain.

Thus there was gradually growing up in the country, side by side with a disaffected population, a real Turkish party, which had arrived at the conclusion that nothing could be done for the country without a radical change of system. Such Turks saw the childishness of the so-called statesmanship of Abdul Hamid in playing off one race against another, and Abdul Hamid failed to recognise the growing importance of a revolutionary committee in Europe. This committee had already begun the organisation of revolution. One of its most daring emissaries was Dr. Nazim Bey. He is still living, and of late years has tended to shew rather the illiberal side of his character, but it is beyond doubt that he is a splendid specimen of the typical emissary of revolution. He is a Moslem, and had obtained a French education as a medical man, and when he offered his services to the Committee in Paris they were readily accepted. If he could be induced to write his life it would be full of wonderful escapes and of daring episodes.

Disguised as a pedlar Dr. Nazim went to Smyrna, entered into communication with officers in the army, and fomented the already existing dissatisfaction with the Sultan. He is asserted at other times to have put on the white turban of a *seracli*, and to have preached sedition in the mosques. Before any of these episodes occurred he was already proscribed as a dangerous rebel. The disaffected Turks already mentioned had formed a committee in Salonica, and in order to get into communication with them Dr. Nazim disguised himself in the Greek brigand's fustanella, joined a band, landed at the Piræus, crossed the frontier into Turkey and descended into Salonica, where many men had known him, but where he was rightly confident that the Zaptiehs would not attempt to penetrate his disguise, but would regard him as friendly to Abdul Hamid's Government. He was welcomed by the Committee, many of whom had become members of an Italian lodge of freemasonry, and was once more sent on a confidential mission into Asia

Minor. This was the commencement of the famous Committee of Union and Progress which was to revolutionise Turkey.

Let me now leave the narration of matters connected with the historical development of the country and turn to some personal incidents connected with this period.

CHAPTER XV

BARON MARSCHALL VON BIEBERSTEIN

The Baron's Greeting—The Fire-eaters at Home—Fehim Effendi's Escapades—Abdul Hamid's Protection—The German Ambassador's Ultimatum—Fehim's Banishment and Death—Sir Nicholas O'Connor's Thoroughness—Our Sunday Excursions—A Turkish Superstition—Hannibal's Tomb—Egyptian Affairs—Death of Sir Nicholas O'Connor—The Kaiser's Protest—Baron Marschall's Methods—A "Thorough" Man.

I RECALL that in about the year 1905 or 1906 I went by Orient Express from Paris to Constantinople. At Munich, where we usually waited an hour, to my surprise I met Baron Marschall, who had come in from his estate in Bavaria in order to go by the same train to Constantinople. It was at the time when some of the German newspapers were attacking England furiously, and when counter attacks appeared in a few English papers. When the Baron saw me he drew himself up to his full height, probably six feet three, put his thumbs in his waistcoat and greeted me with the remark, "Dare we speak to each other, Mr. Pears?"

I replied that I was not afraid if he were not.

"What are we to do with these fire-eaters in your country and mine?"

I suggested that if he would give me the names of the six worst editors who were trying to make mischief between the two, I would give him those of the worst six in London, and we could knock their heads together.

He remarked he would willingly join in the knocking. He called the waiter of the restaurant car, and told him

to reserve a table for two until we got to Constantinople. We had known each other fairly intimately before. I certainly greatly enjoyed the two days' journey with him.

Some months afterwards there came a matter of business in which one of my clients was interested, and in which a German, with whom I had nothing to do, was also interested.

The British and German Ambassadors had common ground of action against the same person. The episode is curious and worth telling.

There was a British subject who some months before had had slight business dealings with a foster-brother of the Sultan, named Fehim Effendi. The most charitable explanation of Fehim's conduct is that he was largely bad and partly mad. He was a man of violent temper, a heavy drinker, had the reputation, right or wrong, of having killed two Armenian girls who would not consent to his proposals, drove about Pera in a specially gorgeous carriage, and was looked upon with dread by shopkeepers and natives generally. The Turks attach considerable importance to the relationship of foster-brothers, and Fehim had always had the friendship of Abdul Hamid from babyhood. He committed all sorts of irregularities and crimes, took goods without paying for them, and had a street coachman nearly whipped to death by his servants because he had asked for payment of his fare. Indeed, there was hardly anyone in Constantinople who had not some tale to tell against Fehim, but as the protected of Abdul Hamid they had long since disbelieved in the possibility of redress at his hands.

On a certain day I received a hastily written letter from an English client whom I knew slightly, stating that the bearer would give me further details. The information was to the effect that this client was in the principal hotel in the city and dared not move out because there were at least two persons on watch outside the door, who, the writer of the letter believed, were there to assassinate him. The bearer then told me that Fehim had written demanding the loan of £400, and the bearer produced Fehim's card

making such a demand. The Englishman had replied that he was not a banker and could not and would not let him have the money. Thereupon Fehim had again written stating that he wanted £700, and intimating that if he refused to furnish it that day it was at the peril of his life. The bearer had seen two persons whom he recognised as creatures of Fehim waiting outside the hotel.

As the matter appeared of importance, I at once went to see Sir Nicholas O'Connor, shewing him the card. Sir Nicholas sent an urgent message to the palace requesting that orders should be sent to Fehim not to misconduct himself. Fehim heard of the action of the Ambassador, and immediately sent another letter, which I saw, and which was spotted over with drops probably of cognac or mastic, in which he declared that he had learnt that the Embassy had been informed of his demand, and adding, "Now I'll make an end of you. I'll wipe you out." Under this threat my client did not dare to venture out, but sent the letter on to me. Sir Nicholas at once took the matter in hand personally, demanded an audience of the Sultan and shewed him the letter. Abdul Hamid laughed, and said he recognised the handwriting and that Fehim was always doing something or other foolish. He promised redress.

Contemporaneously with these proceedings, which had trailed over two or three days, another incident occurred. Fehim, for some purpose of his own, wanted a cargo of wood, and learning that a Turkish ship had arrived in the Bosphorus from the Black Sea with just about the quantity that he required, he sent his men on board, who took possession of the ship, although the master called attention to the fact that the cargo was consigned to a German subject. Fehim cared nothing about that. The German Ambassador sent up a steam-launch attached to his *Stationnaire*, and had the ship brought down to Constantinople by its German crew. When Fehim heard of this step he sent men, who surprised the small crew of the sailing-vessel and gave orders to the men whom he placed on board to shoot anyone who attempted to come on board. Meantime the German

subject had wisely left the care of his interests to his Ambassador.

Baron Marschall sent making strong representations to Abdul Hamid, who tried his usual game of making excuses, declaring that the matter must be looked into and a decision taken in the law courts. Thereupon Baron Marschall did the right thing. He sent to the Sultan and demanded either that Fehim should be banished from Constantinople, or that he himself should receive his passports. This was on the very day when Sir Nicholas O'Connor had demanded that steps should be taken to prevent Fehim from assassinating the Englishman. With two such heavy guns directed against him Abdul Hamid had to yield, and Fehim was sent from Constantinople to Brusa.

I may as well finish with Fehim, although his fate does not concern that of either of the Ambassadors. At Brusa he at once began playing the same wild game that he had played with impunity in Pera. No woman's honour and no man's property was safe from his attacks. He had taken his amazingly showy carriage and made himself such a general nuisance that the Vali telegraphed to the Grand Vizier that he would not be answerable for the peace of the city unless steps were taken against Fehim. Thereupon the Vali received instructions to place him under arrest. He was forbidden to go outside the limits of his house and garden. There he remained for many months, until the Revolution of 1908. Then he claimed that as liberty was decreed to everyone, the Vali had no right to keep him longer in confinement, and immediately commenced his old wild games. At the end of one of these there was a popular rising against him. The mob surrounded his carriage and killed him, hundreds of persons putting their knives into him in token that they wished to share the responsibility of his death.

The work that Sir Nicholas O'Connor did as Ambassador was not, I believe, so highly estimated in England as it deserved to be. He was essentially an unobtrusive but a conscientious worker, as I had many occasions of seeing.

On perhaps the first occasion on which I went with him for a trip on board the beautiful little Dispatch boat, the *Imogen*, I had an illustration of his thoroughness in work. He was fond of coming down to Prinkipo on Saturday night, sometimes alone, at others accompanied by one or more friends. On many such occasions he would call at our house on the Saturday evening and ask whether I was free to accompany him on the Sunday. If I were, we would fix upon the place to be visited: he would attend eight o'clock mass at the Roman Catholic church on the Sunday morning, and I would go on board the *Imogen* at nine, and we would steam away, usually for some interesting historical site. Indeed, all round the Marmara there hardly exists a site which is not full of interest.

I have the pleasantest recollections of several of these trips. Mr. Hasluck of the British School of Archæology in Athens had been my guest, and had greatly interested me with his experiences at Cyzicus, and I had suggested to Sir Nicholas that we should pay him a visit. This we did, the distance from Prinkipo being, I suppose, about forty miles. I need not describe the antiquities, though we were both greatly interested in them. But we went to see what had been a remarkable artificial lake used in classic times for naumachy. A mountain stream had been dammed so as to form a small lake, and the sides of the hills near had been arranged so as to form almost a complete circle or theatre for the spectators. There they could witness mimic fights between the vessels on the lake below them.

As we passed along a small lane by the side of a marsh, we, that is, Sir Nicholas, the captain of the *Imogen* and myself, became aware of a hideous stench, and concluded that near us was the decaying body of some animal. When we passed beyond a hedge which separated us from the marsh, we then saw a sight which astonished us. There were many leaves of a large lily from eighteen inches to two feet long and a foot broad, and some of them were coloured with the most brilliant hues which a painter could produce—blues, scarlets, yellows, greens, orange and purples, in

astonishing profusion. None of us had ever seen the like. We were accompanied by two or three labouring men, and Sir Nicholas asked whether a root of this gorgeous plant could be dug out so that he might take it back to Therapia and plant it in the Embassy garden.

In returning from the ancient ruin we found that a man had dug out one of the lilies containing a leaf so decorated. On our way back to the ship we again noticed the disgusting stench, and the captain, who was a few yards ahead near the man who was carrying the plant, cried out, "The stench comes from this plant." This we found to be the case. As we pulled from the boat to the *Imogen*, the ship's doctor, as he saw the plant being carried on board, at once recognised it, and said that it must be put in the farthest place away from his quarters. It was the *lilium assafoetidum*. He told us the story of one that had been taken home by a brother doctor, had been planted below a drawing-room window, and all unsuspecting, the drawing-room had become so intolerable that the floor was taken up to see whether dead rats did not exist. Finally the culprit was found to be the plant; it was removed, and with it the stench.

On another occasion I greatly wished to see the ruins of Heraclia on the north side of the Sea of Marmara. I had written a good deal about the place, and realised that it had been an important city with a great theatre containing the pedestals of four pre-Constantine Emperors, that its church, during the Middle Ages, was a Metropolitan of great reputation, and that it had figured constantly in Byzantine history. The journey was too long to be accomplished in one day, so it was arranged that we should cross the Marmara, examine the ruins of the theatre, of the Metropolitan church and of the existing church, and steam away to San Stefano during the night. The theatre stood on the sea-shore, and the thousands of spectators had before them surely one of the most magnificent panoramas to be found on the Mediterranean or its neighbourhood. Beyond the stretch of the Sea of Marmara was the island which has given to it that name, and beyond that the superb Bythinian Olympus.

The theatre had been largely hollowed out of the side of the rock. Unfortunately, as I indeed know, the marble seats had been shipped off in order to be employed in the construction of the Great Mosque of Suliman the Magnificent. The statues had of course gone, but happily the Turk always possesses a certain reverence for that which is written, the common explanation being that on the inscribed stone or paper the name of God might exist, and the pedestals which recounted the deeds of the Emperors whose effigies had been placed upon them remained virtually unchanged. Then we crossed the hill and went to a great mass of ruined buildings which represented the Metropolitan church. There still exists one corner of it in which service is held once a year, but Heraclia, instead of being a populous town as it once was, is now a miserable village which exists about a mile from the ancient church and theatre. The church now used probably dates back to the ninth or tenth century.

We all looked into this church, and the priest was courteous, as I have ever found Greek priests to be when they realise that you are interested in the objects about their churches. We found that he had collected certain fragments of sculpture which belonged to a good period. Personally, I was not satisfied that he had shewn us all the objects which he possessed, and I lingered behind the rest of the party and told him so. Whereupon he took me in to a building near the church and shewed me a number of fragments of sculpture which I should dearly have liked to buy. Two obstacles prevented me from doing so; first the difficulty of getting them away, and secondly, the impossibility of making an arrangement in reference to them which would be recognised as having been made by someone who had accompanied the British Ambassador. When some months afterwards I found means of getting a friend to visit the church, the fragments had all disappeared.

I may be allowed to mention one more place which I visited with Sir Nicholas. On this occasion the American Ambassador and his wife were on board like myself as

guests, and another American lady, Mrs. Norton, a woman of great charm, enterprise, and nobility of character. Her husband, whom I also have the pleasure of knowing, had been American Consul, I think at Erzeroum, during the Armenian massacres, and he and she had played a noble part in saving the lives of Armenian women and children, most of whom were connected with the Roman Catholic mission. She herself, a good American Puritan, was astonished at the recognition which the Catholic authorities shewed of what she had done. My attention was called to her services by seeing upon her drawing-room table in Smyrna a portrait of His Holiness the Pope with an inscription stating that it was presented to her by him. Her account of the interview was one of the brightest pieces of *naïveté* and delightfulness that I have heard. She had not sought an audience, but had been informed that if she went on a certain day, properly gloved and got up, she would be allowed to see what she wanted to see at the Vatican. Thither she went, and, as she described it, almost before she realised where she was she found herself in presence of the Pope. He received her with great kindness of manner and expressed his thanks for the care which she, a Presbyterian, had taken of a portion of his flock.

But to return to the visit with Sir Nicholas on the *Imogen*. We had arranged to go as far as Ismidt, but gathering clouds threatened heavy rain, and I suggested that we should stop at a well-known ruin usually spoken of as the Crusaders' Castle and situated at Gibseh. This we did, and went on shore. I knew that my old friend Hamdi Bey, the director of the museum, had built himself a summer residence quite near the castle, and that his son Edhem had made a careful study of the building. Happily we found Hamdi at home. He at once joined our party. I will not attempt to describe the ruins. As a curious piece of incongruity there was within the enclosure the tomb of a Turkish dervish, hung round, as so often is the case, with hundreds of rags, and this led the conversation naturally to the widespread belief that some benefit would accrue to hanging upon his tomb

some portion of one's dress. The ladies seemed more interested than we were, for they lingered behind. Some of us, however, heard the swish of some garment which was being torn, and when they rejoined us the canny belief was expressed that "no one should ever lose a chance. There might be nothing in it, but again there might be."

We had not time to go a distance of about a mile and a half into the country from the castle in question to see Hannibal's tomb. I, however, have visited it on two occasions, and see no reason to deny that it may have been his tomb. The place is now called Gibseh, which correctly enough represents the locality on the Gulf of Ismid where Hannibal is reputed to have died. The so-called tomb is marked by two huge unhewn stones, which have probably been near the centre of one of the tumuli which exist in considerable numbers between the Black Sea and the Gulf of Ismid, and in still greater numbers in Thrace and southern Bulgaria. In the latter place I counted from one point upwards of one hundred such mounds. Travellers on the Orient Express, if it ever run again, may readily count nearly that number between Slivnitza and Adrianople.

Perhaps the most serious question with which Sir Nicholas O'Connor had to deal concerned the recognition of Britain's position in Egypt and the maintenance of the boundaries of that country. Over the Tabah incident for three months Sir Nicholas was worried daily by the Sultan's creatures in Egypt and by his Ministers, who hoped to obtain some concessions which would "save the Sultan's face." But he was inexorable. Eventually he triumphed, as for the first time England's right to act for Egypt was officially recognised by the Sultan.

Looking back upon the events of the last thirty years it is impossible to doubt that Egypt was detached from Turkey entirely by the want of statesmanship of Abdul Hamid. No Englishman can doubt the sincerity of the great English statesmen who had to deal with the Egyptian question. However much a small section of Englishmen desired that

Egypt should form part of the British Empire or be under its control, the nation had no such wish. When Ismail was deposed not only were the financiers of western Europe, and especially of France, satisfied ; not only did the fellaheen of Egypt find their condition improved, but there was a general recognition that even the fiscal changes introduced under British administration had improved the financial condition of the country as well as that of the bondholders. When France, unwisely from the point of her own interests, refused to join us in putting down the Arabi insurrection and afterwards in the occupation of the country, and when in her disappointment she used all the influence she possessed at the Porte to prevent Abdul Hamid sending troops as Mr. Gladstone had invited him to do to enter with our own, we were in the full period of pin-pricks by France. Mr. Gladstone had given his word that our occupation was only to be temporary. Lord Salisbury, on his accession to power, confirmed that promise, and no Englishman can doubt that the promise of either of these men would have been kept if unforeseen circumstances had not changed.

A witty Frenchman publicly observed in France that the cry of that country for the departure or the expulsion of British troops was hollow, because he observed that whenever there was an announcement that our troops were about to leave Egypt, down went the value of all Egyptian securities. Then there came the incident already described of Sir Drummond Wolff's negotiation of a Treaty, and of the bad faith and supreme folly of Abdul Hamid in refusing to abide by the conditions in that document. During the whole of this period he would never recognise the right of the British troops to be in Egypt, or recognise us as being in possession. It will astonish some of my readers to learn that from the Turkish newspapers, which were always severely censored, no student would learn that British troops ever were in Egypt at that time.

In the negotiations that took place the fact had of course to be recognised, in order that the stipulations as to their quitting the country might be set out, but there was nothing

even there beyond the recognition of the fact that our troops were in Egypt, for the Treaty was never allowed to be published in Turkey. Then came the Tabah incident, which was not merely an attempt to take away a portion of Egyptian territory, but one intended to show that the Sultan would not allow even the boundaries of Egypt to be discussed by England. It finished with a recognition that England had a right to negotiate on behalf of the country. All Abdul Hamid's machinations had failed up to that point. He continued until he was deposed to intrigue with the Khedive and Ghazi Muktar, a General who had been largely successful in defeating the Russian army in Asia Minor in the war of 1877-78, and who appears to have entered sincerely into Abdul Hamid's desire to get the English out of Egypt. The Khedive usually spent a portion of each summer in Constantinople, and it is no secret that on more than one occasion he had to be told quite plainly that if he continued his intrigues he might have to follow Ismail into exile.

I judge that Sir Nicholas O'Connor was never physically strong. He did not spare himself when he had a duty to perform, and during the last year of his life his work was heavy. He died on April 1, 1908, at the Embassy in Constantinople. I well remember the occasion of his death. He had been ailing for several days, and I had gone on board a large excursion steamer to meet and have tea with a passenger. The captain informed us while we were at tea that the flag of the *Stationnaire* had been placed at half-mast, and we suspected that the worst had happened. Ten minutes afterwards a messenger arrived on board from Mr. Hope, M.P., the brother of Lady O'Connor, requesting me to go at once to the Embassy. I lost no time in doing so, and Lady O'Connor, hearing by accident of my arrival, sent down to her brother requesting that I would not leave until I had gone upstairs to see her.

It would be impertinent that I should give any particulars of the conversation which I had with her. She knew, she said, that *he* looked upon me as a sincere and trusted friend. We all sympathised with her in her overwhelming grief, for

she as well as her husband had the respect of all classes of the community. Sir Nicholas was given what may be described as a public funeral. Every Ambassador and the staff of each Embassy took part in it. The leading members of the British and other colonies followed, and he was laid to rest at his own request in that portion of the British cemetery at Scutari where hundreds of his fellow-countrymen who perished in the Crimean war lie buried. Lady O'Connor placed over his grave a small mausoleum.

In connection with this cemetery an incident occurred which is not without interest. Sir Nicholas one Sunday morning wrote and asked me if not engaged to go with him to the cemetery in question. Unfortunately, I had arranged to accompany an archæologist friend, who was leaving next day, round the Walls. When two or three days afterwards I saw Sir Nicholas, he told me the following story. In front of a part of the cemetery the Anatolian Railway Company has constructed a wharf and quays. These have undoubtedly taken away from the view in our cemetery. Many members of the British colony who lived near had called the attention of Sir Nicholas to the disfigurement produced by these constructions. He proposed at least that the railway people should leave a space in front of it where a landing could be put, so as to save a long and weary walk along the whole length of the quay to the cemetery. The company apparently took no direct notice of his remonstrances, but they made representations to Berlin, and the belief of Sir Nicholas was that the Kaiser had written to Queen Victoria complaining that he, Sir Nicholas, was objecting to the railway company exercising its rights in regard to the foreshore of the cemetery. The Foreign Office had communicated with Sir Nicholas, and hence his desire before replying to see once more what was the position of the obstructing buildings. The landing has not yet been made.

If I were to say that there was considerable resemblance in character between the German Ambassador and Sir Nicholas O'Connor, some of my friends who knew both would be

disposed to object, but I maintain my proposition. Both were painstaking men. In any matter which either of them took up each was determined to make himself fully master of the facts, and once he had arrived at a decision would worry the matter through to a solution. Each was a genial man, and each was desirous of obtaining all the information he could about political matters in Constantinople, and of hearing the opinion of all, whether officials or civilians, public servants or ordinary citizens.

I had myself received a useful lesson on the importance of learning the opinion of the man in the street from Mr. W. E. Forster, of whom I saw a good deal in the late autumn of 1876. He told me that he wished to consult a foreigner in Constantinople whom I knew well, a quiet, good-natured, rather stupid man. I suggested that he would not get much out of him. He agreed, but remarked that it was always valuable to know the opinion of men of average intelligence who, though they did not take much interest in politics, reflected general opinion. In the same way both Sir Nicholas O'Connor and Baron Marschall were always on the alert for information from anyone, and anxious to hear every opinion.

CHAPTER XVI

THE REVOLUTION OF 1908

Secret Committees—Sir Philip Currie's Anger—Turkish Procrastination—The Sick Man of Europe—Abdul Hamid a Bar to Telephones—Condition of Army and Navy—Ignorant Officers—Disaffection General—The Salonica Committee—Methods of Secrecy—The Third Army Corps—Enver and Niazi in Revolt—The End Approaching—Corruption and Tyranny—Espionage Everywhere—Turkish Women Involved—The First Shot—The Decision of the Fetva Eminé—The Troops Refuse to Fight—Wholesale Promotions—Afraid to Tell Abdul—The Court Astrologer Requisitioned—The Sultan Bows to the Storm—A Wave of Popularity—Spies Abolished and Liberty Proclaimed—General Rejoicing.

I HAVE already mentioned that the misgovernment in Turkey had led to the formation of committees, both in and out of Turkey, with the object of bringing about a change of government. Every foreign power interested in the good government of Turkey, but especially England, France, and Italy, was anxious in its own interest to effect reforms throughout the empire generally. The massacres in Armenia had disgusted not merely the whole of the Christian population of the empire, but thoughtful men amongst the Turks. In the Public Works Department nothing could be done without bakshish. The Minister was a creature of the Sultan's, whose history was typical. He was one of two brothers, both of whom professed Christianity, and, as not infrequently happened, when they got into office became more subservient than the Turks. They had the reputation, rightly or wrongly, of being always open to bribes.

One of the brothers had been the editor of a newspaper in one of the states of North Africa. While there he had distinguished himself by the bitterness of his enmity towards Great Britain, and had gone out of his way to make personal attacks upon Queen Victoria. When he came to Constantinople, his brother already being in power, he paid a visit to Sir Philip Currie, who described the interview to me on the following day. A card was brought in bearing a not unusual Turkish name, for in the part of the country from whence he came many names are employed equally by Moslems and Christians. Sir Philip glanced at the card, saw that the name was, as he thought, that of a Turk, and gave instructions that he should be admitted. He was first struck in conversation by the volubility and the correctness of his visitor's French.

The man began by saying that no doubt His Excellency knew that he had attacked England, but explained that that was all in the way of business, and now that he had come to Constantinople he was quite prepared to take up a different line. "Who on earth can the man be?" was the thought of Sir Philip, and in order to obtain the information he made an excuse to get back to the table, to take up the man's card, and then found that it had upon it, "Editor of the —." Thereupon Sir Philip recognised that he was the responsible editor who had been attacking the Queen, and at once addressed him in something like the following language: "You are the scoundrel who dared to attack Queen Victoria. How dare you put your foot inside this Embassy? There is the door. Go! Get out!"

The other brother was much more wily, and had a French wife who was greatly respected and against whom no one had a word to say. He rose to be Minister of Public Works. I was engaged professionally in obtaining from the Government for clients an agreement, the terms of which had been settled by both parties, and only required the signature of the Minister. I attended several weeks in succession, and was put off with excuses. The matter required further looking into. "Come again next week," was the invariable

answer. This game went on for nearly three months. The honest members of his Council, and I believe in fact all of them except the president, recognising that the project would be for the advantage of the country, saw that the Minister was intentionally delaying the matter. He had told me that there were points in the agreement which members of the Council wished to examine again.

I did not believe him, and went boldly to the Council—to most of the members I was fairly well known—and asked what were the points as to which further consideration was necessary. One of the most prominent members replied there were none. Every member had approved of it, and all that was necessary was to obtain the Minister's signature. "He is here now," said one of them. "Then," said I, "I am going to see him, and shall tell him that I have your assurance that nothing is wanting but his signature." I went into his room and he began, in the most plausible way, telling me that he was doing his best, but that his Council considered the matter required further consideration. Then I opened out upon him. I told him that I had just seen the Council and that they had assured me as one man that there was no point which required further consideration, and I added, "You have told Sir Nicholas O'Connor that you are doing all that you possibly can to further this and all English business, and it is you, and you alone, that are stopping this business." He assured me that I was mistaken, and that I had no right to make any such statement.

A second person was in the room who, I think, was his secretary, and he appealed to him for confirmation of the statement that the Council wanted to give the matter further consideration. I said at once that I did not believe it, because I had just left the Council. The person in question was immediately sent to the Council Chamber to enquire, and came back after two or three minutes with the statement that I was quite right. Thereupon the Minister begged my pardon, sent for the document, signed it, and I took it away with me. As in the department of Public Works, so in every other matter. The creatures whom the Sultan had placed

in power needed only one qualification, unswerving loyalty, *per fas et nefas*, to his interests.

I remember at the time having a long consultation on legal matters with eight or ten of the leading advocates in Constantinople. One of the oldest and ablest members present declared that the Courts of Law were never so rotten as at that time, that the administration of justice was worse than it had been twenty years earlier. "I quite agree with you," said another old lawyer; "at that time if you wanted to get hold of a judge you found his man and made your bargain with him. Nowadays the judges will come round themselves." All agreed that in cases where the rights were in the slightest degree doubtful a decision had to be paid for. If the man had influence a judgment might be obtained without bribery, but ordinarily not otherwise. The whole administration of the country was rotten through and through.

There were two grievances in particular that made the Moslems, as distinct from the Christians, opposed to the Government. The first was palace espionage, the second the terrible restriction of travel applied both to Moslems and Christians. The average Moslem has the virtues of a dominant race. He is usually one who tells the truth and has the courage of his opinions. But it was commonly said that neither in the streets nor in their private houses were they free from the espionage of the Sultan's agents. Bulgaria and other Balkan States, even a quarter of a century ago, employed the telephone as commonly as it is employed in western countries. Neither the Sultan nor his Ministers would permit it to be employed. Probably every Minister to whom projects for the establishment of telephones was submitted was opposed to it. It is within my knowledge that very large sums were offered to the Government, which was always in want of money, and to Ministers privately, for a concession to establish telephones. But applications were met with constant refusal. The explanation was that given to me by one of the ablest of the Ministers. "Abdul Hamid sends to us at all times, night and day. If we had telephones

in our houses we should be rung up every hour of the night."

In the country districts the misgovernment was most markedly seen in the want of protection to life and property. A mine-owner would not venture to work the mine without taking the *zaptiehs*, or police, of the neighbourhood into his pay. Many mines were in consequence shut down. Natives and foreigners alike who had acquired tracts of land let them go to rack and ruin rather than pay the sums which the police and local government tried to exact from them.

The condition of the army and navy aroused the indignation of the best men among the Moslems. Young officers who had passed through the military schools were sent off to regiments in the provinces and not allowed to return to the Bosphorus. I remember a conversation with a captain amongst them whom I knew well. He declared that there was no *camaraderie* in the army, and that he himself did not know who were the other officers in his regiment. The navy, as I have already mentioned, had been allowed to become nearly worthless. Promotion in it was due to palace favouritism. An efficient Turkish officer and gentleman, who had been for a time in the British Navy, told me that his one chance of promotion was through the connection of his wife with one of the palace ladies. There was no question or pretence of merit or of ability, but simply of favouritism.

The Sultan's palace at Yildiz was surrounded by troops commanded by ignorant officers. Amongst these troops in the later years of Abdul's reign the Albanians held so favoured a position as to render plausible the statement made to me by an officer of the Genie, a corps corresponding to our Royal Engineers, that the army would like the chance of attacking the regiments around Yildiz and of killing every man in them. What Abdul Hamid apparently dreaded both in the army and navy was a tendency towards improvement of any kind. In 1908 it was commonly believed that at least 20,000 of the most intelligent officers in the two services had been banished to remote provinces. The story was

common that others had entered the palace, but had never been seen alive again.

It was from such causes that when we reached the year 1908 the disaffection towards the Sultan had become general. The chief committees in Paris and Salonica, after a long search for reforms, had arrived at the conclusion that the most practical remedy was the establishment of constitutional government. A fairly well-drawn Constitution, drafted by Midhat Pasha, had been accepted by Abdul Hamid in December, 1876, and promulgated, as already stated, as a counterstroke to the proposals of reforms made by Lord Salisbury, General Ignatief, and the other members of the European Conference. A Turkish parliament had actually met, but Abdul Hamid, finding that it could not be dictated to, had solved the difficulty to his own satisfaction by bundling off the whole of the members in the course of a single night from Constantinople (July, 1877) and decreeing that the portion of the Constitution which related to representative government should remain in abeyance. During these long years of misgovernment the really workable instrument of Midhat had never been forgotten. To have openly advocated its re-establishment would, however, have meant the suppression of any newspaper in the Empire.

When the Committees at Salonica and at Paris had seen the failure of the Powers to carry out the Mürsteg Programme, their determination to obtain the Constitution was increased, because it was in Macedonia more than in any other part of the Empire that the effects of misgovernment were visible. They had seen gendarmerie established in Macedonia and had observed its beneficial effects in the section of country assigned to British and French officers. They noticed, however, that Austrian and German officers had either taken no part, or were strangely lukewarm in their exertions, so that the beneficial effect was not general.

The Salonica Committee, as nearly as I can fix the date, was established in the autumn of 1905. Of course anyone known to be connected with a revolutionary Committee would have been at once seized, and therefore it had to have

recourse to secret methods ; and an organisation said to be founded on the lines of freemasonry was established and soon had branches throughout the Empire. There was always some display of secrecy in the election of its members and the promulgation of its orders. One of these members, who is since dead and who was a trustworthy man, told me of his own experiences. He was summoned by a secret Committee whose notices I have often seen—sealed, but never signed—to attend at a certain house. He obeyed the summons. After certain formalities he was shewn into a room where in front of him were three masked men, seated at a table. The centre of them addressed him by name and said they knew that he had borne a good character, but they wished him to become one of their members. They explained generally their objects, with which he declared himself in sympathy. He was then asked, and consented, to swear an oath of fidelity to the Central Committee, and was informed that if any orders were given respecting him they would always be confirmed through a person who was named.

The Paris Committee had at its head Ahmed Riza Bey, who must have become known to many hundreds of Englishmen, though I am not aware that he speaks English. He was, and is, a man of essentially conservative tendencies, and an opponent of violence. In Paris the Young Turks had already taken the title of the Committee of Union and Progress, often indicated in later times by its initials as the C.U.P. It is undoubted that during the two or three years preceding 1908 the movement spread throughout the empire with great rapidity. In presence of the great army of spies people had become desperate, and the old question was constantly asked amongst Europeans, " Were the spies themselves loyal to Abdul Hamid ? " *Quis custodiet custodes ipsos ?* The answer is that as the movement increased there is good reason to believe that some of the spies themselves played a double game. But the Committee probably got more information about the doings at Yildiz than did Yildiz about the doings of the Committee.

The great feature about the organisation of the Committee was, in my opinion, its secrecy. No ordinary member knew more than two or three persons who were associated with him. He did not know who were the leaders, and influential men amongst them told me that it was very rare that the chairman at one meeting appeared more than once. The Committee was a great power without visible organisation, but which soon made its influence felt throughout the empire. One of the first objects of the Salonica Committee, which soon became much more powerful than that in Paris, was to obtain influence in the Third Army Corps, which was stationed in Macedonia. It was to this province that the undue proportion of young military officers trained in the military schools of the Harbia in Constantinople had been sent by Abdul Hamid. Thus the ground was well prepared for sowing disaffection. It is said that by the end of 1907 practically the whole of the Third Army Corps had sworn fidelity to the Constitution. But other portions of the army, and especially in Asia Minor and Adrianople, had come under the influence of the Committee.

We Europeans in Constantinople knew of the existence of the Committee, but we knew little of its ramifications, and I myself asserted in the British Press at the time, that though disaffection was general, there was apparently no organisation amongst the disaffected that gave any prospect of success. The writer of an able paper in *Blackwood's Magazine* of January, 1909, as an illustration of the way in which the Committee kept its secret, states that a British officer of the gendarmerie who was immensely popular with the Turks told the writer that until two months before the Revolution he knew nothing of the adherence of the army to the movement.

In truth the régime of misrule under Abdul Hamid was rapidly drawing to an end. He had begun the system of arbitrary rule by appointing Ministers who, so far as he could accomplish it, were deprived of power. After a while, and sometimes ostentatiously, he named sub-ministers who were chosen for their known hostility to their chiefs. The

Ministers often became mere clerks. In a conversation with one of them some years ago, after dwelling upon the universal corruption that prevailed in every department, he remarked that we should never get rid of it until the Sultan was changed. To my reply that the mere change of sovereign would probably not be a remedy, he answered, "We shall at least get back government by Ministers instead of by the palace clique." The Minister was right in the position he took up, because amongst the evils of Abdul's rule was the tacit permission given them to fill their pockets at the expense of the State so long as they were subservient to his wishes.

The results of corruption had steadily increased. Custom-house duties were divided between the Exchequer and the officials. The Valis, or Governors, paid for their appointments and often contributed a portion of their salaries to the palace gang which kept them in place. In return, no inconvenient questions were asked of their extortions in the provinces. Public meetings were everywhere forbidden, and during the last four or five years of Abdul Hamid's reign no wedding festivity or dinner-party could take place among Turkish subjects without the permission of the authorities and a scrutiny of the list of invited guests. An attempt was even made to prevent evening parties and balls at wealthy European houses, and when, with the aid of the Embassies, this demand was resisted, spies were stationed round the houses to forbid the entrance of Turkish subjects.

Not a line was permitted to be printed in any newspaper office until it had passed the censor. If a historian had to depend for his information upon files of Turkish newspapers, Egypt during these years would be considered to be still under the direct rule of the Sultan as it was before 1879. The word Armenia was not permitted to be printed. "There is no such place," said the chief censor. Macedonia was tabooed also, and this to such an extent that it was difficult for the Bible Society to obtain permission to print a translation of the text of St. Paul's message, "Come over into Macedonia and help us." The censor claimed that the

sections of the three provinces into which Macedonia had been divided should be substituted. Theatrical performances were censored with equal severity. "Hamlet" and "Julius Cæsar" and a host of French historical plays were forbidden because they spoke of killing a king.

After the massacres in 1895-97 nearly all the Armenians had been expelled from Constantinople, and the result was that the industrious mass of guardians and workmen, who had been in the habit of sending the largest portion of their income to their villages in Armenia, were thrown out of work and their families reduced to starvation. The army of spies was constantly increased. Some of the smaller fry only received a salary of £2 to £3 a month. One man, a foreigner, is known to have obtained £90 a month. One year's Budget of Turkey set the sum of £1,200,000 aside for spies.

Thousands of men belonging to every class of the community, Mahometans as well as Christians, were denounced and taken for secret examination to the palace or other police authorities. Very few were ever sent for trial, but were dealt with arbitrarily. Abdul Hamid made a serious mistake in dealing with suspected Mahometans. They were usually banished from the capital and sent into remote provinces. There they became the centres of revolution. The whole empire was thus prepared for revolution when an organisation should declare for it. Everywhere there were exiles of ability and energy above the average, and full of a sentiment of hostility towards the Sultan. In some of the provinces, as for example in Erzeroum, the exiles were so numerous and so superior in reputation and ability to the Governor and officials, that they practically became the rulers of the provinces, and in one case which I reported in the year 1906, the population, led by the exiles, dictated to and obtained from the Sultan a change of governor.

In the army the system of espionage destroyed its *esprit de corps* and created a strong current of dissatisfaction among the officers, who were thus prepared during the two or three years preceding 1908 to welcome the emissaries of revolution. As the months passed on and the system of espionage failed,

Abdul Hamid's only remedy was to make it the stricter. The local post was abolished because it facilitated conspiracy. Letters to and from the provinces in the Turkish post were ostentatiously opened and delivered open.

So long as the Sultan confined his persecution to the Christian communities, the Moslems made no strong objection, though in justice to them I must repeat that there was always a considerable number who condemned the Armenian massacres and other atrocities, sometimes out of sympathy with the innocent victims, but more usually because they recognised the injury that was done to the welfare of the country. When, however, Abdul Hamid began to make himself objectionable to Moslem and Christian alike, misfortune made the two parties join forces. During the first half of 1908 the Committee of Union and Progress was joined by numbers of Turks, Albanians, Bulgarians, and Greeks.

A curious development of the movement was due to Turkish women. Though there were female spies, yet the manner of life of Turkish ladies was more favourable to the new movement. It offers many facilities for carrying messages which are not at hand for men, for Turkish public opinion would not permit either spies or ordinary police agents to search them. They were much more outspoken than their husbands and brothers. Moreover, a large number of the wealthier class of Turkish women had received education in French and English, and their ideas had been influenced by what they read. They played a large part as emissaries of the revolutionary party. They conveyed letters and verbal messages from one harem to another. They were not less active in Macedonia than were their sisters in the capital. The agents of the Government endeavoured to preserve the loyalty of the troops by representing the revolutionary movement as one favoured by Greeks and Bulgarians and against the Faithful, but Turkish women instinctively knew better.

The Sultan's spies no doubt sent hundreds of reports on the situation to Yildiz. The Sultan became alarmed, and,

ever eager to crush disaffection, sent a Commission to Salonica with instructions to stamp out the movement everywhere, but especially in the army. In Constantinople we heard much about this Commission, and for the first time we learned that Yildiz was afraid of an insurrection. The satisfactory feature about it to us foreigners, and to all the Christian population, was that it was confined strictly to Moslems. The Commission was composed of some of the ablest of the adherents of the Sultan. The general belief existed that it would be followed by many executions. Its immediate effect, however, was very different from what Abdul Hamid anticipated. Two officers in the army took to the Resna Mountains and boldly declared themselves in opposition to Abdul Hamid; these two men, whom the Commission had reported to Yildiz as the leaders amongst the disaffected in Salonica, were Niazi Bey and Enver Bey, now Enver Pasha, the Minister of War. Niazi was the first man to raise the flag of revolt. This was on July 5, 1908.

The Turkish general in the northern portion of Macedonia was Shemsi Pasha. Niazi had publicly declared for the Constitution, and the secret Committee had issued manifestoes in favour of it, which were posted in Monastir, the largest town in that district of the country. But the Committee and Niazi had chosen and well prepared their ground. In the country between Monastir and Ochrida the great majority of the soldiers had sworn fidelity to the Constitution. When Shemsi marched against Niazi he was shot ostentatiously in broad daylight in Monastir itself by one of the officers of the army which he commanded, who, when he had killed his man, walked coolly away, not a hand being raised to arrest him. When the news reached Yildiz frantic telegrams were sent to stamp out the movement. Nazim Bey, not to be confounded with Dr. Nazim or with another Nazim whom we shall hear more about, who had been in prison for seven years in Armenia, endeavoured to crush out the rebellion. But it soon became evident that the army in Macedonia would not act against the rebels. Forty-eight officers were arrested on the report of Nazim on

July 8, and sent off at once to Constantinople, their principal accuser being Hakki Bey. Two days afterwards Hakki was shot in Salonica, and on the following day, July 11, Nazim Bey was wounded in open day in the streets of the same city. His would-be assassin was not even arrested. Nazim immediately returned to Constantinople to report to the Sultan, and a second Commission was sent on a similar mission to its predecessor.

Enver Bey, who had been attached to the staff of Hilmi Pasha, was the first man accused by this second Commission. They, however, acted with more cunning than their predecessors. Enver was invited by Abdul Hamid in flattering terms to proceed at once to Constantinople to inform His Majesty of the position, and at the same time promises of promotion were made to him. Enver, however, was much too suspicious to be caught by this kind of flattery. He therefore, as already mentioned, went to the Resna Hills, and with him there went a considerable number of soldiers. The movement of Niazi had become an insurrection. Two days after Hakki Bey had been shot the C.U.P. publicly associated itself with the insurrection. At the same time the Second Army Corps, which was stationed at Adrianople, supported the demands of the Macedonian troops, and when the Committee cabled direct to the Sultan that unless he granted the Constitution the Third Army Corps would march on Constantinople, the Second Army Corps associated themselves with its comrades.

When Shemsi was killed Osman Pasha was named as successor, and began his career at Monastir by a message from the Sultan threatening the direst punishment upon the insurgents, and promising all sorts of rewards to those who remained loyal to Yildiz. The result was that the troops fired upon the Pasha.

In the spring of 1908 the Grand Vizier was Ferid Pasha, an Albanian of pure blood. In my opinion it is beyond doubt that he behaved loyally to the Sultan. I have known him personally for several years and believe him to be not only an honourable and trustworthy Moslem, but a man of

exceptional ability. I may here interpolate the story of his appointment. He had been Governor of Konia, and on my visit to that city, four years after the Revolution, I found that both natives and foreigners spoke highly of the justice of his government and of his character.

Two or three years before the time of which I am speaking, the post of Grand Vizier became vacant, and, as I have already explained, Ferid Pasha was appointed as a stop-gap under the impression that he might be removed when the two secretaries of the Sultan agreed as to his successor. But it was impossible in the spring of 1908 that so intelligent a man as Ferid should not see that the arbitrary rule of Abdul Hamid was in extreme danger, and equally impossible that he should not sympathise with the movement to get rid of it. Let it be noted that in Constantinople and throughout the country no one had yet spoken of deposing the Sultan. All that they wished was the re-establishment of a Constitution and the transformation of the Government from an absolute to a limited monarchy.

When Shemsi was shot, and when the revolt began rapidly to spread throughout Macedonia in July, Ferid Pasha was ordered by the Sultan to take measures with the heads of the army to put an end to it and to punish the discontented. Ferid pointed out that this was not the business of the Grand Vizier, but of the Minister of War. Let me remark in passing that Turkish Ministers have always been very susceptible to any invasion of the privileges of their ministry. The Sultan however, instead of leaving the matter to his Minister of War, took it into his own hands. He had shewn on many previous occasions that he believed he was much more competent than any Minister, and the one institution in which he still had confidence was that of espionage. To set spies to work, and then set others to spy upon them, was his great panacea against political troubles. He at once ordered forty spies to report upon the conduct of the troops in Macedonia, and of course to send the names of those officers whose loyalty to him was doubtful. Unfortunately for Abdul the object of the mission became at once known

and was resented by the great mass of army officers to whom espionage of course was peculiarly obnoxious. Shortly after the Revolution General von der Goltz published a letter in the *Neue Freie Presse* in which he expressed the opinion that the system of espionage was the principal grievance of the Turkish soldier. When the mission of the forty spies was known, many men who had hesitated to join the disaffected party now saw their safety lay in throwing in their lot with those who demanded reforms. An influential number of officers telegraphed to the palace their request that the Chamber of Deputies should be assembled. Abdul Hamid soon learned, for the telephone was constantly working between Yildiz and Salonica, that this demand was backed by the whole Third Army Corps, that is, by nearly all the troops in Macedonia. Thereupon the Sultan was more determined than ever to suppress the movement. He ordered troops from Smyrna to go to Salonica, evidently believing that these troops did not share the discontent amongst their fellow soldiers.

Then there came a serious obstacle, one, in fact, of an entirely unexpected character. Moslemism itself was about to oppose Abdul. Against such a conflict of Moslem against Moslem the Sacred Law of the Sheri is especially strict. But, evidently believing that the class of Ulema in Constantinople, consisting of the heads of the Islamic faith, would make no objection, Abdul Hamid applied formally to the Fetva Eminé, that is, the head of the Chief Court of Sacred Law, charged with the issue of fetvas or legal decisions, for its authorisation. I may explain, in passing, that the form of drawing a fetva and the practice of employing it is in the line of direct descent from the time of the Emperor Justinian. Upon the statement of a simple case, and the payment of a small fee, a decision may be obtained from the Fetva Eminé on almost any point of Turkish law. I have obtained at least twenty such decisions, most of them relating to questions of succession. They correspond to what students of Roman law know as *responsa prudentum*, the "answers of the learned in law." Such answers or

fetvas are authoritative, and form precedents for future use.

The question put for Abdul Hamid was in the usual form, and to this effect: "Is war justifiable against Moslem soldiers who rebel against the sovereign authority?" The Court, however, decided that before giving an answer they must have a statement of facts, which should include the demands of the discontented. I had the pleasure of knowing the Fetva Eminé at the time. He is usually a judge occupying a lofty position and a man of ability and character. The actual occupant had the confidence of all Moslems in Turkey on account of his piety and independence. "He would not shake hands with me," said one of the ex-ministers, in speaking of this judge in the early autumn of 1908, "because he knows that I am not regular in my prayers." He was a very old man, probably eighty-five, but was universally respected as one who cared nothing for the judgment of men, be they Sultans, Ministers, or paupers. Accordingly, when Abdul Hamid asked for the fetva, both sides held their breath in expectation of what his decision would be. After he had obtained the demands of the troops and fuller explanation of the facts, he gave his answer. Substantially it was that the demands for reforms for the redress of grievances and for government by Representative Chamber were not against the Sacred Law, and consequently if the demand for a fetva were pressed it could not sanction the war by Moslems against Moslems.

In consequence of this decision, the Smyrna troops which were on their way to Salonica were sent back. When this step was known, the Salonica army formally declared that they would not fight against the revolted troops in Monastir. From that decision to making common cause with them was but a short step. Then came a telegram to Yildiz which sounded the knell of Abdul's rule. It was sent either on July 21 or 22, 1908, and demanded the re-establishment of the Constitution, or abdication, mentioning at the same time that the revolted troops had sworn not to lay down their arms until the Constitution was established.

Meantime the Sultan had not been idle. His great object was to get rid of the disaffected officers both in the army and the navy. Within the first fortnight of July 2,000 officers in the navy were promoted. Fifty-five columns of the Turkish official papers were filled with promotions in the Third Army Corps at Salonica and the Second at Adrianople. The Sultan had become seriously alarmed. The Ulema had failed him and the demand in the telegram from Monastir for the re-establishment of the Constitution was like a thunderbolt. Actually it was an ultimatum. Almost continuous sittings took place during the forty-eight hours after its arrival at Yildiz. They must have been curious meetings. I have heard accounts of them from three different persons who were present. It was known that the Sultan was in a most irritable mood, and to suggest either his abdication or his compliance with the demands of his revolted officers was more than any Minister ventured to undertake. Each man looked at or suggested his neighbour.

At length someone proposed that Abdul Houda, the Court astrologer, should be called in as the only man who dared suggest to His Majesty that he should accept the Constitution. The mention of such an officer reminds us of the curious mediæval attitude still existing in the Turkish mind. Everyone knew that such a functionary existed, that he was consulted on all important occasions, and that on account of his facility for reading the heavens he was supposed to bring supernatural knowledge which could not be despised. Let me say in passing that, after the Revolution, the cunning old astrologer came to live in the island of Prinkipo and near to my own house. Those who knew him, amongst whom I was not one, spoke of him as a kindly, well-intentioned man who did not appear to have much faith in his own reading of the stars.

He was, however, brought before the Council, and after considerable hesitation consented to give the advice that everybody present felt must be given, but dared not give. He was ill at the time, and had to be carried into the room upon his sick-bed. But he gave his advice boldly. Though

he was distrusted by the Committee, they nevertheless looked not unfavourably upon him during the few months of life which remained to him, for his boldness in daring to advise the Sultan to accept a Representative Chamber.

The Sultan even yet hesitated to accept the recommendation, and his telegram to Hilmi, who was in Salonica, urged resistance. But the Committee were determined, and at their request Hilmi sent a telegram to the Sultan stating that he was in the power of the Committee and would be shot if the Constitution were not proclaimed within forty-eight hours. Then, but not until the evening of July 22, Ferid Pasha resigned. He had never declared himself in favour of the Committee of Union and Progress, but he knew the country too well to advise His Majesty to resist a demand which had become almost universal.

Then the Sultan recognised that he must bow to the storm. He sent for the two men whom public opinion generally recognised as the men of the highest reputation in the ministerial class. One was Kutchuk Saïd and the other Kiamil Pasha. Each of these men had at one time believed his life to be in danger from Abdul Hamid's vengeance. I have told the story of Kutchuk Saïd's taking refuge in our Embassy in the time of Sir Philip Currie. Kiamil had taken refuge in the British Consulate at Smyrna at a more recent date, until Sir Nicholas O'Connor received assurances that if he came to Constantinople his person and property would be safe. They were summoned to the palace because they had the reputation of being favourable to Constitutional Government and to British institutions, and therefore likely to be popular. On the evening of the 22nd the Sultan published an irade declaring that Parliament would be convoked.

All ranks and classes in Constantinople went delirious with joy. The proprietors of the Turkish newspapers met together and agreed to a resolution which they immediately carried into effect to turn out the censors from each of their offices. The decree only spoke of a Representative Chamber. The Turkish papers chose to interpret it as granting all the rights under Midhat's Constitution, a document which

during thirty years had been idolised by Turkish reformers as a symbol of liberty. The popular cries became, "Vive la Constitution!" and "Vive le Sultan!" A new cry taken up everywhere at once followed, "Down with the spies!" a cry so dangerous that Abdul Hamid and the creatures around him who were opposed to the popular movement dared not interfere. Word was passed round that on Friday, July 24, the Sultan would go in state to St. Sophia. Many years had passed since the Sovereign had visited this stately temple raised by the great architects of the time of Justinian for Christian worship, and justly regarded by the Turks after their capture of Constantinople in 1453 as the glory of the city. Pera, Galata, and Stambul burst out with the greatest display of flags which I have ever seen.

The Revolution was an unmistakably popular movement. By this I do not mean that it was without leaders, but that people of all ranks were full of the revolutionary spirit, and, once action had commenced, the leaders would have been incapable of stopping it. Newspaper people, who had felt as acutely as any section of the population the burdens of Abdul Hamid's coercion, were among the first to take steps to support the Revolution. They all denounced the system of espionage. At the last moment Abdul declined to go to St. Sophia. Had he gone he would have been frantically welcomed. As it was, throughout the 24th the mere announcement of the Sultan's intention to cross the Horn and go thither made Abdul for the time popular. An enormous crowd, however, gathered before Yildiz, which is about three miles from Stambul. They clamoured to see the Sultan, and kept up a continual shout for him and the Constitution. When he shewed himself at the window in reply to these cries he was cheered by a mob consisting about equally of Moslems and Christians. From the window he made a short speech, in which he declared that henceforward all his subjects, without reference to race or religion, would be treated alike.

On Sunday, July 26, a crowd of mollahs and softas, the latter being students of Moslem law, made another demon-

stration at Yildiz in which the cry was raised for the first time in the Sultan's presence, "Down with the spies!" The Sheik-ul-Islam was present, and other leading men representing the chief teachers of Islam. The Sheik-ul-Islam swore the Sultan to respect the Constitution of Midhat. This was another distinct step confirming the popular interpretation of the original irade which spoke only of the assembling of Parliament. The Council of Ministers met, and an order was issued abolishing the item in the Budget which provided for the pay of the spies. The Moslem portion of the crowd on this Sunday passed from Yildiz to the residence of the Armenian Patriarch in Pera in order to express their fraternal feelings with his community, and subsequently visited the Orthodox Patriarch and even the Bulgarian Exarch.

Speeches were delivered in many places, in mosque yards, even in the great mosque of Sultan Ahmed itself on the Hippodrome. Everywhere it was proclaimed that the Revolution meant "hurriet," or liberty, equality, and fraternity, above all no distinction of men on account of their creed. In conversation with two of the leading speakers, of whom one was a Jew, they spoke with enthusiasm of the sincere desire which existed among the leaders of the Revolution to have the adherence of all Christian denominations of the empire. The Armenians responded cordially, and on this Sunday and on the following days speeches were delivered by leading Armenians and Greeks declaring that henceforward it would be possible for the Christians of the empire to co-operate cordially with their Moslem brethren for the benefit of the empire.

I had seen something of both these demonstrations. In that of the Monday, which took place before the Town Hall of Pera, immediately opposite to which is my own house, I estimated that there were at least 2,000 Turkish officers and military students in the great crowd. In the processions which went through the streets it seemed to me that every public carriage in the place had been taken possession of. Such carriages in Constantinople are usually open, and an

arrangement had been made in which a *savachi*, or mollah should be seated side by side with a Christian priest. At the principal points passed by this procession, prayers were publicly offered up for the Sultan and for the Constitution.

The sight was a novel one. Hundreds of carriages nearly all with occupants of two different faiths, thousands of people, about equally divided between Moslems and Christians, prayers clearly and distinctly read either from a carriage or from some point of vantage, and the whole crowd standing in the usual Turkish attitude of devotion, that is with the hands held up horizontally, the palms skywards. At the end of each prayer there came a great volume of *Amin*, followed usually by cheers for the Constitution. These processions were undoubtedly carefully organised but none the less the enthusiasm was general and honest. One of them entered the courtyard of the British Embassy in Pera, the Ambassador and his staff, however, being absent at their summer residence at Therapia. On Sunday, July 30, Sir Gerard Lowther arrived, and the cheers for King Edward and for the new Ambassador were such as could not leave any Englishman unmoved.

CHAPTER XVII

THE YOUNG TURKS IN POWER

Popularity of Great Britain—The Waring Guard—Great Britain's Disinterestedness—Abdul Hamid's Oath—Prisoners Released—A Grave Mistake—Ugly Rumours—A New Ministry Under Kiamil—Abdul Hamid and the Kaiser's Letter—Success of the Revolution—The Palace Staff—Abdul Hamid's Orders—Von der Goltz Suspected—Turks' Vagueness as to the Constitution—I Visit the Sheik-ul-Islam—A Remarkable Man—The Secret Methods of the C.U.P.—A People Transformed—An American Lady's Adventure—"Yasak"—A Precipitated Revolution—The Austrians and the Albanians—A Difficult Situation—The Sultan's Favourites.

NOW that we are fighting Turkey it is interesting to recall the great popularity of our country. It was not merely that we had assisted the Turks in the time of the Crimean war. It was natural that Armenians, Greeks, and Bulgarians should be ready to demonstrate in favour of Great Britain, but it might have been anticipated that the Moslems at least would have hesitated to declare in our favour. They have never done so. We have always been popular with the Turks, and the reason is to be found in the excellent reputation for justice and fair dealing that England has enjoyed for many centuries amongst the people of the Turkish empire. In spite of the fact that every Turk knew that we had worried Abdul Hamid during a generation on account of his misgovernment of Macedonia, that our statesmen had spoken of him with abhorrence, and other prominent people with loathing, on account of his unqualifiable cruelties in Armenia, Turkish Moslems bore us and still bear us no ill will.

I may be pardoned for uttering a truth that is not so well known as it ought to be, that the British nation obtained a reputation for fair dealing and for love of justice as far back as the eleventh century, and has, unconsciously perhaps, lived up to it. Anna Comnena, an Imperial Princess occupied with events during the middle of the twelfth century, speaks of the Waring Guard,* composed of men of the same race as ourselves and largely added to by detachments of Englishmen who left our country after the Battle of Hastings. She has much to say of the loyalty and love of justice of these English soldiers, and she tells a tale in illustration which is worth remembering.

A Greek woman killed a member of this famous Imperial Guard. She was brought to trial before the Court of the Warings, and all anticipated that she would be condemned to death. But, placed upon her defence, she admitted that she had killed him, but described how he had attempted to violate her. The decision of the Waring Court was not only that she was justified in what she had done, but that all the *peculium* and other property belonging to the man whom she had killed should be given over to her. "This," says Anna Comnena, "is an illustration of the love of justice of these barbarians." Their reputation for a love of justice greatly impressed the Princess, and has been maintained ever since. The valuable works of Paul Rycaut in the latter half of the seventeenth century, of Sir James Porter a century later, and many other writers, might be quoted to shew that both the members of the British community and the Levant Company, which lasted from 1603 into the nineteenth century, steadily and successfully sought to live up to the ancient reputation of our race.

I have already alluded to the fact that in the massacre of Chios, Englishmen were ever ready to act in defiance of the laws and the religious fanaticism of the country, when they came into opposition with the higher laws of humanity. In

* This Guard is spoken of by the great French historian and soldier, Marshall Villehardouin, in 1204 as English and Danes.

spite of differences of religion, the Turkish Moslem respects conduct founded upon national tradition, and especially when such tradition appeals to the higher motives of mankind. Moreover, though the knowledge of the history of our country among the Turks is of the scantiest, we have the reputation of being the protectors of the desolate and oppressed, and our protests against Abdul Hamid's misgovernment and cruelties were appreciated even by men who had no sympathy with Greeks or Armenians. They knew also that England is a self-governing country.

It astonished the old-fashioned Turks that we should have consented to have a woman as our sovereign, but they had sufficient intelligence to recognise that such sovereignty meant the government of the country by what we call Parliament. When, therefore, the misgovernment of Abdul Hamid united all parties into opposition against him, it was natural that England, far more than any other country, should be looked to as likely to sympathise with movements in favour of liberty and justice ; and the spontaneous demonstration of all ranks of the people which burst forth on the arrival of Sir Gerard Lowther was a great testimony to our traditional reputation. The nation recognised that we had not worried the Porte about reforms for Armenia and Macedonia in order to gain territorial or other advantages, but because England sympathises and is expected to sympathise with people struggling to be free.

Events passed rapidly during the week after the proclamation of the Constitution. On Tuesday the 28th the Committee of Union and Progress formally demanded the dismissal of Izzet and Tahsim Pashas, who had been for long the chief advisers at the palace. Ismail, the head of the Artillery Department, was also sent about his business, with the object, probably, of obtaining control over the guns. The cunning old astrologer Abdul Houda, probably the most intimate confidant of the Sultan, was dismissed, and left Pera for the island of Prinkipo. The Ministers of War and of Marine were dismissed, the latter having remained longer in office than any of the

Sultan's Ministers. Habib Melhame, one of the agents, *anglice* spies, returned to Constantinople from a holiday, went immediately to the palace and was advised by his friends to get out of the country as soon as possible. He was arrested at the frontier and brought back to the capital. However, he and his two brothers managed to escape, one of them, at least, with a large fortune. Most of such men saw that the crisis was upon them, and tried to get away. Those who remained, believing that the storm would blow over, soon found themselves in prison.

The taking of the oath to the Constitution by the Sultan had been done before very few persons. The Committee considered that the representatives of the Powers should have official knowledge that the proclamation of the Constitution had been made, and on the 31st they obtained from His Majesty a declaration to the representatives of the Powers that he, Abdul Hamid, had sworn to abide by the provisions of the Constitution. The following days were occupied in the swearing in of the troops in Constantinople. The oath of loyalty to the Sovereign was made ostentatiously conditional upon his loyalty to the Constitution. The ordinary troops took this oath willingly, but some anxiety was felt as to whether the Palace Guard, mostly composed of Albanians who had been greatly favoured by the Sovereign, would be ready to take it. After they had seen that their comrades, not belonging to the Guard, had taken the oath, they followed their example.

On the proclamation of the Constitution, Kutchuk Saïd was made Grand Vizier, and marked his advent by a serious blunder, which did much to shake his popularity. The political prisoners, of whom there were many, in every prison in the capital, were at once released after the proclamation. Many of the poor fellows as they were let out were incredulous, while others became delirious with joy. They passed from filthy and dark prisons to be received in bright sunshine by excited crowds of friends, to be placed in carriages, to be cheered and accompanied to their homes by men and women shouting and weeping, some indeed laughing

t their sorry spectacle, others shrieking with delight for the new order of liberty.

So far everybody was satisfied, but Kutchuk emptied the prisons, setting free nearly a thousand ordinary criminals, including many robbers and cut-throats. The respectable portion of the community objected to this. When it became known that it was by order of the Grand Vizier, whose only explanation was that in the great prison the ordinary criminals threatened to burn it down if they were not liberated with the rest, the explanation satisfied no one. It was then remembered that Saïd was jointly responsible with the Sultan for the suppression of Midhat's Constitution. My own impression was, at the time, that Saïd would have done better to justify himself if he had pointed out that amongst the criminals set free there were many political offenders unjustly condemned for non-political offences, merely because they were suspected of disloyalty to Abdul Hamid. Saïd was too hasty in opening the prison doors so wide. He soon committed another blunder which led to a belief that he was ready to aid the Sultan at the risk of violating the Constitution.

It had been judged advisable to issue an Imperial Decree, or *Hatt*, emphasising certain points in the great document. Saïd and the Sheik-ul-Islam were charged to draw up the *Hatt*. When it was issued it was at once generally and justly denounced as placing more power in the hands of the Sultan than the Constitution had provided. Article 27 of that document had ordained that the Sheik-ul-Islam and the Grand Vizier were the only Ministers who were to be named by the Sultan. It implied rather than expressed that all other Ministers should be named by the Grand Vizier. The new *Hatt* declared that the Sultan had the absolute right to name, in addition to the two officers mentioned, the Ministers of War and Marine. Such an addition to his powers would make him master of the situation. The excitement was intense.

For the first time since July 24 ugly rumours were about. The Sheik-ul-Islam, whose conduct throughout the Revo-

lution was statesmanlike, immediately resigned. But it was not until August 9 that he gave the explanation of his resignation. He declared that he and Saïd had been jointly charged to draw up the decree, but that Saïd had not even consulted him on the matter. A Minister then in power, with whom I discussed the matter, attributed it to the *cacoëthes scribendi* of Saïd. I never heard Saïd's explanation of the matter, but several of the newspapers declared that the mistake was simply clerical. I can well believe it, from what I knew of Saïd, but following the first blunder he now became too suspect to be allowed to repeat an error so grave. He resigned, and in so doing gave general satisfaction.

He was succeeded on August 6 by a new ministry, at the head of which was brave old Kiamil. He was then on the wrong side of eighty, but throughout his life had always been true to the principles of constitutional liberty, and had looked to England for reforms to be established in his own country.

The Committee, meantime, was actively employed in clearing out reactionary functionaries. All the Ministers had given in their resignation when Saïd resigned. The Sheik-ul-Islam by common consent was allowed to remain. So also was Tewfik, the Minister for Foreign Affairs. It is saying much to state that the new ministry thus formed was the most respectable which Turkey had had for a generation. The Ministry of Mines was placed in the hands of Gabriel Effendi Nouradunghian, an Armenian whom I have known during the last thirty years assingularly able, intelligent, and trustworthy. Each of the Ministers under Kiamil took in hand the clearing of his own Department of useless functionaries, as to which much deserves to be said. There was not a department which was not enormously overstocked. In many cases one man could have done the work efficiently for the half-dozen who worked inefficiently.

Numbers of stories were about like the following, which I know to be true. On one of the first occasions when Abdul Hamid received a letter from the Kaiser there was no one about the palace who could read it with the exception of a

doctor of medicine, who was a Rumanian Jew, and had been in attendance on some of the servants belonging to the horde which is usually attached to the service of every Turkish Pasha. He was introduced to His Majesty, spoke to him well in Turkish, and thereupon gave verbally a translation of the Kaiser's letter. His Majesty expressed his delight that he had a subject, for the doctor had become one, who could read German, and the doctor, having explained what was his profession and hinted that he would like to enter the Turkish service, received an order at once to one of the great public departments appointing him to be the medical officer. The doctor went to the department, presented the order, and the Director of the department himself told me that of course they would have to pay him his salary, but that they did not want his services, and informed him that if he chose to come once a month he would receive his pay, but that he had better not shew himself at any other time. I came to know this Rumanian Jew, and found him, now that he had got into comfortable circumstances, a very decent fellow who took an intelligent interest in European politics, but so long as he got his salaries paid, for he had now succeeded in getting appointments at two other places on the same conditions, he was quite content.

So far the Revolution had been a brilliant success. The Constitution had been promulgated, corrupt Ministers had been got rid of ; there were no spies to dog your every step, to open the letters sent by post and read those received ; no censorship over books and papers, freedom to speak on all subjects, liberty to travel to and fro within the empire without being asked at every turn for your passport, a Constitution which decreed that there should be no imprisonment without trial. All these results had been brought about by the energy of a Committee, mostly secret, which at the same time had acted with splendid moderation and had succeeded without a single case of bloodshed ; it was a superb result.

We who were on the spot sympathised heart and soul with

the new Turkey Party. No fair-minded man who knew the condition of things in Turkey and was present in the early days of the Revolution could help sympathising with them in breaking the power of absolutism as represented by Abdul Hamid. Nor, so far as my own observation went, was there any serious reason to disbelieve in the unselfish aims of the members of the Committee of Union and Progress. The great mass of the community was with them, but of course there were serious elements of reaction. The dismissal of hundreds of employés who had overstocked every department of the State, not because their services were wanted, but to attach them to the side of the Sultan, all these were naturally opposed to the Party which deprived them of their living. I have said that many were employed to compel them to become loyal servants of the Sultan, but there were hundreds of others who were appointed by the ladies of the Sultan's harem, who had no qualifications likely to render them useful public servants. Cooks and housemaids would request those holding office in connection with the palace to provide situations for their poor relatives, and the extent to which these requests were complied with is almost incredible.

In the great Naval School situated in the island of Halki, boys were sent to be trained as officers in the navy who were unable to read and write. A Turkish professor in this college, with whom I was intimate, told me repeatedly of orders they had received which rendered the useful working of the college almost impossible. When he complained that the college was not an elementary school, and that it was useless to teach these boys navigation or any of the other subjects with which a naval officer ought to be acquainted, he was informed that the orders came from the palace, and that all that was possible should be done with the boys. When the annual examination came in order to see who were fit to receive commissions in the navy, the same professor told me that half the boys were incapable of giving correct answers to almost any question set them. The head of the establishment did indeed make a protest, but was told at the

palace that, without regard to examination, the boys must be passed as officers.

The Military School or Harbia was in a similar condition. During a considerable period the young men had had the advantage of instruction from von der Goltz Pasha, a man of distinguished ability, a soldier greatly respected in Germany, and one who took interest in his work. A few of his students followed his lectures very closely and profited by them, but unless the young men chose to work there was nothing to prevent him from remaining idle. An amusing incident occurred in reference to von der Goltz Pasha which he at least has not forgotten. He had before him a map of the environs of Constantinople, upon which Yildiz and the neighbourhood was marked like every other object of importance. On one occasion he seems to have placed his pointer as if by accident on Yildiz and to have asked the question how such a place should be attacked or defended. Spies soon brought the incident to the knowledge of the Sultan, and for a short time von der Goltz was suspended until the Sultan could be assured that the lecturer had no sinister designs.

When Young Turkey attempted to introduce order in the various departments, all who had an interest in maintaining the bad old traditions became opposed, and thus, as the reforms proceeded, the party of reaction increased. It soon became evident that there would be a conflict between the Young Turkey Party and the reactionaries who adhered to the Sultan. Young Turkey, though it profoundly distrusted the Sultan, decided not to dethrone him. Had they attempted to do so at first there would probably have been civil war. "The divinity that hedges in a king" applies equally to a Sultan, and there would always be a party in Turkey in favour of the reigning sovereign. His conduct in the first instance was an illustration of the cleverness which his flatterers represented as genius.

When Abdul learned that the army and the mollahs, who are the two powers in Constantinople which count, were united and determined to exact Constitution or abdication,

he yielded. The only sign of resistance he made in these days was the one already mentioned by which he endeavoured to retain the right of appointing the Ministers of War and of Marine. He endeavoured even to claim credit not only for having re-established the Constitution, but for having been its author on his accession to the throne. Both Moslems and Christians were willing to allow him to put forward such claims so long as he loyally accepted the Constitution, which, as we have seen, he swore to observe. I expressed the belief in an English Review in the month of September, 1908, that his position on the throne had actually been strengthened by his conduct since the Revolution. It would have been difficult and probably impossible for Young Turkey to have dethroned Abdul Hamid had he remained faithful to his oath to respect the Constitution.

It must never be forgotten, however, that all the talk about Constitution, indeed, all interest in political questions, was confined to a small section of the community. The depth of the ignorance of the Turkish masses on such a subject is almost incredible. The ordinary hamal, or porter, in the towns, like the ordinary peasant in the country, when they heard that His Majesty had sworn to be faithful to the Constitution enquired what it was. Was it a person? Was it a new Caliph? And very few could give any clear explanation. The words "liberty" and "equality" meant something good, though they could not have said what. To some they signified general licence. Two English friends of mine were motoring outside Smyrna when they were set upon by a number of Turkish boys, who flung stones at them. The Englishmen gave chase and caught the principal offenders. The eldest was asked why he had thrown stones. "Hurriet var," was the reply. "There's liberty. We can do what we like now." The Englishman replied, "Hurriet var, and I am at liberty to give you a good thrashing. Why not?" One of the boys said yes, he supposed that would be so, but he hoped the liberty would not be used. The Englishman replied that it would not be used that time, but if the offence were repeated he would use it to the fullest extent.

The workmen on a newspaper during this time asked for a large increase of wages. "But why?" asked the owner. "Because there is a Constitution." The tramway men struck for higher wages, and the only justification which they put forward was that there was now a Constitution. Yet men of all classes as they marched below my window cheered in the lustiest manner for the Constitution. Throughout the month of August smuggled tobacco was openly sold in the streets at a very cheap rate, buyers and sellers alike considering that the Constitution allowed men to set aside the law which had made the sale of tobacco a Government monopoly.

The agitation for a Constitution was practically confined to Constantinople and Salonica. But after it had been proclaimed many of the dismissed employés throughout the empire found their way to the capital and increased the number of the disaffected. I repeat that the two powers in the agitation which counted were the mollahs and the army. The mollah caste might naturally be suspected of a tendency to reaction, because the new doctrine proclaimed liberty without distinction of religion to all classes of the community, and such equality was believed to be against the teaching of the leaders of Mahometan thought and against the national traditions. They continued, however, with the Sheik-ul-Islam at their head, to favour the movement.

I was particularly interested in the attitude of the Sheik-ul-Islam and the leaders of Mahometan thought during the autumn of 1908, and being anxious to hear at first hand what was their attitude, I sought and was favoured with an interview with Saba-eddin. It was one which I shall always recall with pleasure. The venerable Sheik-ul-Islam was seated in his beautiful cream-coloured robe, and around him were four or five of the most eminent dignitaries in Turkish Islam. In the course of the conversation I called his attention to the fact that he had declared that Mahometanism was favourable to the idea of liberty for Christians as well as Moslems. He reaffirmed this statement. Then he remarked to me, "I understand that you have paid special

attention to the early spread of Islam during the life of the Prophet and afterwards," and asked what I thought about it. I replied that the century after Mahomet's death was the most remarkable century of conquest with which I was acquainted. Then he asked what was my explanation of it? I said that I would very much prefer to hear his. Without more ado he propounded the proposition that the answer was to be found in the recognition by early Moslems that Christians were to enjoy the same liberty as Believers, and he thereupon mentioned instances of various tribes who had voluntarily submitted to the successors of Mahomet in order that they might have the advantage of the equitable rule which he established.

It was intensely interesting to watch the profound attention which the other dignitaries in the room paid to this explanation. It impressed me, rightly or wrongly, with the idea that they were afraid he should say something that would have been too favourable to Christians. When he had done I suggested that there were many cases, even in early Mahometan history, shewing that Christians were persecuted on account of their faith. He admitted that there were such cases, but said that they were abuses and violations of the teaching of Islam. "The farther we go back," said he, "with the teaching and practice of the first century of our era, the more completely should we find that liberty and equality were taught and practised by early Moslems."

It was evidently a subject difficult to pursue, and once the position was taken up that the persecution of Christians on account of their faith was an abuse, I had little further to say. The incident, however, was profoundly interesting as shewing that not merely amongst civilians, but at the very centre of the Islamic faith in Turkey the idea of religious equality was firmly fixed. Let me add that up to this hour I am unaware that the Sheik or those immediately around him have ever sanctioned any teaching or practice which is not in conformity with the principles thus laid down. It was these men who supplied the religious sentiment which

justified the army in asking for a reform. It is to the credit of Young Turkey that it had succeeded entirely in being supported by the religious section of the Moslem community.

Young Turkey secured the army in Macedonia by getting rid of the reactionary members in the Second Army Corps. The time-expired soldiers of that corps were dismissed and shipped back to their homes in Anatolia. At the same time many officers, whose loyalty to the Committee was trusted, were sent to Stambul and worked amongst the army there. The Committee at once expressed a desire to dissolve as soon as a meeting of the Chamber of Deputies could be obtained, and to hand over the government of the country to be carried on upon constitutional lines. This intention was fairly well carried out. An election took place, and for the first time for a generation a Representative Assembly met in Stambul.

The way in which the Committee of Union and Progress had brought about the Revolution was really remarkable. I do not believe that any foreigner whatever knew of its action until the beginning of July, 1908. The Committee was itself impersonal. I am assured that very few of the members themselves knew who was its temporary leader.

During the nine months following the Revolution of July 23, 1908, a strange delirium of joy seemed to pervade most sections of the community in Constantinople. Absolutism had been got rid of, the hideous hostility between Moslems and Christians had ceased. Satisfaction and hope were everywhere present. As an illustration of this new attitude, let me allude to the story already mentioned of the institution in Constantinople maintained by the Society of Friends, situated at Kum Kapou, a populous Armenian quarter in Stambul where the Patriarch's cathedral is situated. After the brutal massacres of Armenians in 1895-97, certain Quaker ladies took in hand the aiding of the widows and orphans who were the victims of these massacres. Armenian women seem to have a traditional facility for fine needlework. The Quaker ladies in question found materials for them, paid current wages, and numbers of

women and girls were able to live who otherwise, in all probability, would have starved. The produce of their work found a fairly ready sale, mostly in England. Orphan children also were taught gratuitously. Night classes for young men were established, were eagerly attended, and the institution became a valuable educational centre.

I have already told the story how the old hodja joined heartily in the hymn which he had copied down from a placard on the walls, "Holy, Holy, Holy." It will be interesting to hear that he appreciated it very highly, with the exception of the last verse, which brings in the Trinity. But my point here is that after the revolution the work of the ladies in question was allowed to continue, not only without interruption, but was greatly appreciated by the Turks themselves.

It was a wonderful sight to see the transformation in the aspect of the people. The lower classes were happy without exactly knowing why. Massacres had ceased, the good time had come. During the elections for the Chamber of Deputies, processions seemed to be formed spontaneously. Men and boys and even Turkish women joined in them. Bands of music were occasionally procured. Somebody would call for cheers for the Constitution, and a hearty reply was always given. A mollah or a Christian priest would say a few words in praise of liberty, in praise of the new régime which had got rid of the spies, and the applause, always by hearty hand-clapping, was a delight to hear.

Every day we heard of new incidents of the spirit of satisfaction among the people. A Russian lady of my acquaintance, accompanied by an American lady who spoke nothing but English, was crossing the ever-crowded Galata bridge. A Turkish lady was having a dispute which attracted the American's attention, and the Turkish lady appealed to her. Her friend explained in Turkish that her companion only spoke English, whereupon the Turkish lady seized her hand and said, "We are sisters now, because we also have a Constitution. Won't you recognise me as a sister?" The American, when the question was explained

to her, gladly consented, and the two women walked hand in hand across the bridge, rejoicing that both belonged to free countries. "Hurrah for the Constitution!" was the parting salute on each side, though in two languages.

Liberty was in the air. The general aspect recalls that of men who had recovered from a long sickness, of men who have regained sight. Restrictions were everywhere abolished. "Yasak" is the Turkish word for forbidden. Everything had been yasak under the old régime. The native must not be seen with European newspapers; it was yasak. An English official was taking street photographs avowedly for the purpose of helping Moslems as well as Christians. He was stopped. It was yasak. The number of things which were yasak had been steadily increasing during the last ten years. Entrance into the mosque, which for centuries had been permitted for visitors, became yasak. Even entry into St. Sophia during the two years preceding the Revolution was only possible to foreigners under orders obtained through a Consulate or Embassy. The restrictions were silly and irritating. The mollahs did not like them, but were afraid to disobey. Under the new régime people were permitted to meet in any numbers and wherever they liked.

On December 17, 1908, when the Deputies met, the great church-mosque of St. Sophia was crowded inside with visitors, while the outer courts were equally crammed with people. I endeavoured to get in, but amidst the tens of thousands who were present concluded that I must forego that pleasure.

Before leaving the subject of the Revolution, I must call attention to certain incidents which precipitated the Proclamation and caused the Revolution to be brought about in July, and not, as had been arranged, in September. The intention of the Committee was that the Revolution should take place on September 1, the date of Abdul Hamid's accession. In fixing that date they had been influenced by the historical meeting at Reval, where they believed that the Sovereigns had decided to demand the appointment of a

Governor for Macedonia to be approved by the Powers. That would probably have been heartily welcomed, even by the Committee twelve months earlier. It is what the Balkan Committee in England had been urging upon the British Government for at least three or four years. But the project had become too small for the Committee. They now wanted not merely good government for Macedonia, but for the whole of the empire. The Reval proposal looked like the establishment of an autonomous Macedonia, which, following the precedent of Eastern Rumelia, would soon become independent of the empire. Arrangements had been made for a general demonstration on the day already mentioned, September 1, and it would have come off on that day but for an accidental circumstance, if circumstances ever are accidental. So completely were the leaders of the Committee outside Turkey taken by surprise, that when in July the Constitution was proclaimed, the Paris Committee was incredulous. It was hardly less a surprise to the diplomats in Constantinople, who until July 23 had no reason to anticipate a revolutionary change.

The accidental circumstance in question was the following: in Uskub there were several casinos, kept by low-class Austrian subjects. Attached to them, as is usually the case in Austrian cities, were gambling dens and brothels. These places aroused the anger of the Albanian chiefs, who declared that their young men were decoyed into them, lost money, and were debauched. The Austrians throughout Macedonia, and as far as Constantinople itself, have many such dens and licensed houses for women under their jurisdiction. The announcement was made that there was to be a picnic on a grand scale at Fersovitch, about equally distant from Uskub and Kossova. The organisers of the picnic were the Austrian Consul and the keepers of the casinos.

The decent-minded section of the Albanians rightly concluded that it was to be an orgy on a great scale, and determined that it should not take place. They burnt a number of sheds and temporary casinos at Fersovitch, and

sent word to the Austrian Consul that they would not allow the picnic to take place or the train to run. Further, they threatened to burn the casinos in Uskub if the attempt were persisted in. Twenty thousand Albanians gathered on the neighbouring hills ready to carry out these threats. There was nothing political in their action. There was only the honest desire of clean-minded mountaineers to put an end to the debauchery of their sons. When the news reached the Committee in Salonica, as it did very speedily, they became alarmed. They believed, as did we all, that the Austrians were eager for the opportunity of invading Macedonia, and if the Albanians on the hills carried out their threats their action would bring in the Austrians. Moslems and Christians alike would take part in the destruction of the casinos, and the entry of the Austrians would inevitably create such disturbance as to upset the plans for celebrating the proclamation of the Constitution in September.

Prominent and influential members of the Committee hastened to the Albanian leaders. A conference between them was held at Fersovitch, and lasted nearly a fortnight. Galib Bey, the officer commanding the troops at Kossova and Uskub, received orders from Yildiz to disperse the Albanians. Happily, he was himself a member of the Committee, and took part in the conference. The discussions with the Albanians were long and careful. The Albanians are slow-minded men, and hesitated about throwing in their lot with the Committee. At last, however, they came to the conclusion to support their demand for a Constitution. They bound themselves together for this purpose by giving the solemn national oath, the *Bessa*, a form of pledge which the Albanian rarely violates. From that time they became members of the revolutionary party. Fersovitch continued to play an important part until July 24.

It was the entry of the Albanians, who from that time gave their hearty support to the Committee, which caused the Revolution of July, 1908, to be accepted with such unanimity in Macedonia and Adrianople, that no reactionary

party either in the capital or in Asia Minor even attempted to make resistance.

As the Albanians of the capital, who had been the petted soldiers of the Sultan, and favoured to such an extent by him that the other troops in Constantinople were violently opposed to them, had been gathered in barracks around Yildiz, fears were entertained that they might continue their personal loyalty to Abdul Hamid. This fear existed until the attempt of April, 1909. But, except in a few individual cases, the Albanians in the capital followed the example of their brethren in Macedonia, and all conflict between them and the rest of the troops became impossible. This co-operation and non-opposition by the Albanian troops to the deliverers under Shevket Pasha was largely assisted by the fact that the Albanians in the capital, like Ferid Pasha, the ex-Grand Vizier and many others, would have nothing further to do with Abdul Hamid.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE COUNTER REVOLUTION OF APRIL 13, 1909

The Unemployed—Turkish Anti-Semitism—Javad Bey Appointed Minister of Finance—The Reactionaries—A Military Revolt—Disturbing Reports—The Sacred Law—Mahmud Mukhtar's Loyalty—His Flight—My Son's Prompt Action—Surrounded—The Dragomans and the Sultan—An Interrupted Turkish Bath—A Matter of Life or Death—Mukhtar's Escape—A Hail of Bullets—The Meaning of the Movement—A Surprise to the Cabinet—Nazim Pasha's Escape—Dissatisfaction with the C.U.P.—The Comedy of the Steamers—Absurd Anomalies—Turkification and Tyranny—The Nationalists—Official Murders—What Occurred at Salonica—The Army of Deliverance—A Systematic Counter-stroke—The Tables Turned—The Exodus From the Palace.

IT was almost inconceivable that the Revolution should not be followed by attempts at reaction. While it is true that the great majority of the nation, irrespective of race and creed, were delighted to see the power of Abdul Hamid checked, the subsequent reforms which the makers of the Revolution judged necessary, in the first instance to maintain themselves in power, and in the second to provide for free government, created a great many reactionaries. All the dismissed employés throughout the capital, and indeed throughout the empire, naturally preferred the old régime. The thousands of spies saw their occupation gone. These were the two most important classes in the country who were discontented with the new Government. A third class, happily less important in point of numbers, were much counted upon by the reactionaries.

These were the Moslem fanatics. One of the earliest cries raised against the members of the Committee of Union and Progress was that they consisted of Jews, atheists, and freemasons. It was a dangerous cry, for several reasons.

Contrary to the belief which I find exists in England, the Jew is not a general favourite with the Turks. I am simply stating the result of my own experience, because I have no fault to find with the Jewish population of Turkey, whom I have always found as honest and straightforward as any other section of the population. But among the poor Turks, even more than among those who have a certain amount of education, the prejudice against him is very strong. The old-fashioned Turkish Pasha will gather up his robe rather than allow it to be defiled by contact with that of a Jew. The element of truth in that portion of the accusation against the Committee relating to Israelites was that in the Committee certain men of exceptional intelligence became from the first specially prominent. One amongst them, Jevad Bey, shortly afterwards appointed Minister of Finance, was a man of financial ability and possessed of a great faculty for explaining what he meant. A native of Salonica, he is reputed to belong to a Crypto-Jewish sect largely represented in that city, and known as Dunmays, which professes Moslemism, but in secret practises the rites of the Jewish faith.* But while everybody recognised the ability of Jevad, he was probably the most unpopular man in the Committee.

Another Jew, who was almost equally prominent, was named Carasso, whose manners are charming and in marked contrast to those of Jevad. He, I believe, does not profess Islam, but is a Jew pure and simple. I have known him for several years, as well as other members of his family, and have great respect for them all. I do not know that anyone in particular was aimed at when the Committee was labelled as consisting of atheists, Jews, and freemasons. Probably very few of them were addicted to saying their prayers at

* Readers who are curious as to their history will find it fully set out in my *Turkey and its People*.

the stated hours, and more or less in public, for it must be remembered that in connection with each department of the State in Stambul there is a room set apart for the saying of prayers. I do not think that anybody who knew the prominent members of the Committee would be disposed, with notable exceptions, to think of them as religious men. Certainly there was not a fanatic amongst them. But to speak of them as atheists is as absurd as when the lowest class of street preacher in England applies that derogatory term to anybody who dissents from any portion of his "ism."

It probably influenced unfavourably a few of the lower elements of the population. Freemasons used in connection with Young Turkey never appeared to me to have a specially objectionable meaning. As a mason myself, I can assert that very few indeed of the Party were masons before the Revolution. The fact which lent vividness to the term as revolutionary was that in the Italian Lodge in Salonica some members of the Committee had been accepted and, according to general repute, employed the Lodge as a means of keeping the movements of the revolutionary body from the outside world. The cry that the opponents of Abdul Hamid were freemasons had indeed the effect of causing a great many Turks to desire to become masons, and indeed gave freemasonry a lift in the country such as it had never had before. The Revolution, however, would not have made much progress if its supporters had been limited to Jews, atheists, and freemasons. The cry that the revolutionary party consisted of them was really dangerous only in name. I doubt whether it did the cause of Young Turkey any harm whatever, except perhaps among the adherents of the Roman Catholic Church.

The reactionaries were most powerful in Constantinople, and an undercurrent of hostility to the revolutionary Government which had been formed on July 24, 1908, steadily increased. It was, however, very slow to find expression. We learnt that secret emissaries were active in the navy and in the barracks, and we were surprised that no

sign of reaction appeared. A writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* mentions that the Turkish Ambassador in London was completely taken by surprise when he learned that there was any movement in Constantinople against the Committee. It would seem that a large number of the spies had learned their business so completely that they had produced a considerable amount of disaffection. But, as turned out to be the case, the disaffection was of a foolish character. It found vent on April 13, 1909. We in Constantinople awakened in the morning to find that the streets were in possession of the troops, that the bridges were lined with soldiers, and that there was afoot a revolutionary movement of an alarming character. What had happened was that among a great crowd of disaffected troops were a certain number of ulema, men belonging to the class in Islam most nearly approaching to a priestly caste, who had spread the notion among the purely Turkish population, but especially among the troops, that the changes introduced by the Committee of Union and Progress were irreligious and directed against the Sacred Law of the Sheriat.

We learnt that severe fighting was going on in Stambul, which the Eastern imagination informed us had led to the streets of that city running with blood. One of my hamals came to my house to inform me that the bridge between Galata and Stambul was crowded with troops, and that everybody was uncertain as to what was going on. We soon found that there was a revolt amongst the troops, and that the cry amongst them was for the Sheriat or Sacred Law. The mob generally, consisting of soldiers, flocked to the great courtyard of St. Sophia and to the open space between it and the meeting-place of the Chamber of Deputies, and made a noisy demonstration. They were led by hodjas or schoolmasters and mollahs, real or false, and shouted for the law of the Sheriat, for the dismissal of Achmed Riza, President of the Chamber, and for the abolition of the Committee of Union and Progress.

Mahmud Mukhtar was in command of troops at the Seraskerat in Stambul, and appeared to have been practi-

cally the only officer in command who remained loyal to the Committee. During the day Nazim Pasha, Minister of Justice, was assassinated because he refused to give up his revolver to a soldier. Three or four other Turkish notables had also been killed. Messages were sent backwards and forwards from the palace, but with little result. No one doubted that the demonstration was favoured by Abdul Hamid. The cry amongst the soldiers and the mob was that religion was in danger. Abdul Hamid sent word to the troops declaring his own respect for the Sheriat and promising amnesty to all the mutineer soldiers. Firing went on during all the morning, but of the silliest character. The troops discharged their rifles into the air and shouted in favour of the Sacred Law. The few deaths which took place were mostly accidental.

By two o'clock in the afternoon firing had ceased. Here I pause in my narrative to mention two incidents of that day.

Mahmud Mukhtar, as already mentioned, was in command at the Seraskerat. The son of the famous Mukhtar who resisted the Russians valiantly in 1877-78 in Asia Minor and was formally declared Ghazi, Mahmud Mukhtar had been carefully trained as a soldier in Germany, and being in command of the troops at the Seraskerat, believed it his duty to resist the rioters. Almost the only fighting which took place on the day in question was at the barracks under his command. He was prepared to resist the demonstrators and to put down the mutiny with a strong hand, but express orders came from Abdul Hamid at Yildiz to cease all resistance. His soul abhorred such a step. Either the movement was a treasonable one against His Majesty, or it was one which had the Sultan's consent, and in either case ought to be resisted. He continued to resist until he learnt that orders had been sent by the Sultan to capture him dead or alive. Thereupon he managed to escape from the barracks, and took a caique across the Bosphorus to his house at Moda which adjoins those of the late Sir William Whittall and of my eldest son.

My son, who had arrived from Constantinople about four

in the afternoon, had taken with him a hamal in order that he might be sent as messenger if one were needed. He had not been long at his house when, walking in the garden with his wife, he saw a person scaling his wall from the garden which he knew to belong to the house of Mukhtar. Looking round for an explanation, he saw that a block of three or four houses was being rapidly surrounded by troops, and recognised that the person who had escaped into Sir William Whittall's garden was Mahmud Mukhtar. My daughter-in-law observed that the troops were spreading themselves out so as to include the three houses of Sir William Whittall, Mahmud Mukhtar, and my son. Meantime Mukhtar, who had disappeared amongst the bushes, shortly afterwards found his way into Sir William Whittall's house. He was aware that he was being hunted by Abdul Hamid's orders, and had provided himself with a brace of revolvers.

My son joined him in Sir William's house, while Lady Whittall gave notice to the officer in command of the troops, who by this time surrounded the house except on the sea-front, that the house being British no person could be permitted to enter either it or the grounds without a consular order. The officer at once explained that his instructions were to respect the national character of the houses. Almost immediately after the appearance of Mahmud Mukhtar, a hasty note was written conveying information to the British and another to the same purpose to the German Embassy regarding the condition of Mahmud Mukhtar. The notes were concealed by the hamal, but he had orders on arriving in Pera to convey them to the two Embassies. Later Sir William arrived and was admitted, but orders were given that no other person should be permitted to enter or leave the grounds surrounded by the troops. There was a weary wait from about four in the afternoon, when the house was surrounded, until half-past nine. Apparently Mahmud Mukhtar's only chance of safety lay in the interference of the English or German Embassies.

It is no secret to say that on receiving the news the British Dragoman went at once to the Minister of War,

who replied that he could not interfere because the orders in reference to Mahmud Mukhtar came direct from His Majesty, and he himself had only been appointed that day. Then the Dragoman went to the Grand Vizier, who made a similar excuse. He also could not, or would not do anything. Meantime Mukhtar and my son were discussing the situation and awaiting events. Mukhtar had already proved himself a brave soldier, and no one doubts that rather than surrender he would have laid many of his enemies low with his two revolvers. There I may leave them to mention what was going on on the other side of the Bosphorus.

I know from first hand what went on at Moda. I am not quite so positive as to what was done in the meantime in Constantinople, but I believe the following to be a true statement. Mr. Fitzmaurice had been to see the Minister of War and the Grand Vizier, and failed with both. Someone drew up a strong order directed to the commanding officer on the Scutari side of the Bosphorus, under whom, of course, were the soldiers, who had surrounded the block containing the three houses mentioned. I have heard the contents of this order read, and a stronger one it would be difficult to draw. It was given as Sovereign and Caliph, and ordered the immediate withdrawal of the troops and the cessation of all attempts upon Mukhtar. Who was charged with obtaining and transmitting the order I have never been able to learn, but the story as told is romantic.

The order drawn up in Turkish may have been the joint product of the brains of the First German and the First British Dragomans. It was then taken to the palace for signature. The messenger was informed that the Sultan was in his Turkish bath and could not be seen. The answer was that it was a matter of life or death. He was conducted to the outside of the bath and knocked. The Sultan demanded angrily who was disturbing him. The officer replied that the matter was one of life or death. Thereupon the Sultan opened the door, and the officer presented the decree ready for His Majesty's signature.

The Sultan peremptorily refused to sign it. Then, upon the reiterated statement that it was a matter of life or death, it seems to have dawned upon the Sultan that it might be a matter of life or death for him, and after some hesitation he signed. That done, the officer got away from the palace as quickly as possible, crossed the Bosphorus and saw the officer commanding the troops. The Sultan a few minutes afterwards repented of what he had done, and immediately summoned his servants to find the messenger and bring him back. They were, however, too late to catch him.

Mahmud Mukhtar and his two guests were meantime waiting upon events. About nine o'clock they heard the recall sounded, and their servants soon informed them that the troops were lining up, and, shortly afterwards, that they had marched away to the neighbouring barracks known as Selimieh, at Hyder Pasha. One of the servants of the house, who could be trusted, was sent outside to see whether they had really gone away, and it was found that they had done so. Mahmud Mukhtar during the night went on board a yacht anchored near, and on the following morning I observed from my chambers in Galata a German launch steaming out of the harbour. It had been arranged that this vessel should make its way to the island of Proté, having first gone into Moda Bay and taken up a passenger. A fine steamer under the German flag was leaving that morning, and as it passed near Proté a steam-launch went alongside it, a passenger ascended to the deck of the liner, the steam-launch returned to Constantinople, and on the following day the liner arrived at the Piræus and Mahmud Mukhtar went ashore, to embark on the following day for Salonica, where he arrived without incident. Let me add to this part of the narrative that when some weeks afterwards I met Shevket Pasha, already Commander-in-Chief of the army, Mukhtar introduced me to the great soldier as the "Father of my saviour," a phrase which struck me as having in French a somewhat irreverent sound.

All the events which I have been narrating centred round April 13, but the day closed with another which I must

mention. My wife and my daughter and I had received an invitation to spend an evening at the British Embassy, but as my wife was not well I preferred to remain at home with her. My daughter, knowing that there was to be a ball after dinner, took a different view, but being chaperoned by a friend, went to the Embassy. At about eleven o'clock I was working in my library when a servant came in and asked did I know that war was going on. "No, I have heard nothing." "If I open the shutters you will hear the rattle of rifle-balls all round." I ran in all haste up to the terrace of our house, and sure enough, heard the rattle of hundreds or perhaps thousands of rifle-balls. It turned out to be only the amusement of the troops, who were firing aimlessly and making a demonstration. But I became anxious for the safety of my daughter and her friends. It was a beautiful moonlight night, and from my terrace I commanded three or four streets, and found that they were absolutely empty. As I was on the point of starting for the Embassy, distant about half a mile, a carriage stopped at my door and her kindly chaperones deposited her. Sir Gerard and Lady Lowther, with the aid of the secretaries, had received news of the firing and behaved admirably. They quietly arranged that people should go away as speedily as they could without creating alarm, and succeeded thus in emptying their house of visitors.

It was not until two or three days afterwards that we learnt the sequence of the incidents of the famous 13th of April. The great note of the day for all Europeans was one of uncertainty. It was so then, and even to the present remains so, for I am convinced that no one knows the full truth regarding the events of what was a notable day in the history of Turkey. What is certain is this: that in the early morning a large number of marines from the arsenal, and of troops stationed in several of the barracks in Stambul, mutinied. Why they mutinied is not even yet clear. It is also beyond doubt that many of their officers were ill-treated, imprisoned, and in some cases killed. Afterwards the great courtyard of St. Sophia and the

open space on its south side, which is faced in another direction by the then meeting-place of the Chamber of Deputies, were soon filled with Turkish soldiers. There they were soon joined by many mollahs and hodjas, some of whom were subsequently found to be Abdul's agents disguised. They wore the white turban and thus passed as *saracilis*. These persons evidently had been instructed to make definite demands, the most important of which were the establishment of the Sacred Law or Sheriat, and the destruction of the Committee.

On the 13th and 14th probably five hundred persons were wounded, and apart from those who were killed in fair fight, defending under Mahmud Mukhtar's guidance the Seraskerat barracks, there were probably between two and three hundred persons killed through the reckless discharge of ammunition. Soldiers crowding the local steamers at the Galata bridge took it into their heads to fire off their remaining cartridges into the air.

Meantime people were asking what was the meaning of the movement? A change of Grand Vizier was the traditional reply to a popular Turkish demonstration, and accordingly Tewfik Pasha, who had been Ambassador to London, was appointed with Ministers under him. As he rode in customary fashion from the Sublime Porte in Stambul to the palace at Yildiz, about three miles away, the troops lining the streets kept up a constant *feu de joie*.

The demonstration was a bolt from the blue. Nobody had expected anything of the kind. It was so sudden, however, that the leaders of the Committee fled to ground. Achmed Riza, President of the Chamber, Jahid, a man of violence but also of great sincerity and honesty, who edited the semi-official organ of C.U.P., had also to go into hiding. Indeed, I cannot recall any single member of the Committee who did not for the moment disappear. The mob, which later in the day consisted not merely of the troops, mostly without officers, but also of a number of civilians, amused itself by destroying the offices of the two leading newspapers acting as organs of the Committee, and of wrecking the committee-room.

To a certain extent the demonstration of April 13 was remarkably well managed. It was apparently spontaneous, and for the most part made by the soldiers without the intervention of their officers. The troops marched as regularly as if their usual officers were at their head. They kept good order among themselves and towards spectators. To me they looked so happy as to suggest that they treated the whole matter as a huge joke. I was personally a witness of the care taken to inform civilians that they had nothing to fear. Indeed, for several days afterwards the city was full of stories of the kindness of the troops to spectators. A poor dressmaker, finding herself in the midst of the soldiers, was half frightened out of her wits, but she was taken charge of by a white-haired old Turkish officer and led by him through the crowd until she could be put into a tram which would take her home.

The troops were armed with fixed bayonets and ball cartridges, and stood for many hours with nothing to eat. Provision shops were at hand, but not a single case of looting took place. Even when by the orders of some of their leaders they destroyed the offices of the newspapers, and especially of the obnoxious *Tanin*, which was the favoured organ of the Committee of Union and Progress, while they smashed the furniture it was not alleged that they had looted anything. Although there was a curious and inexplicable discharge of hundreds of bullets, I doubt whether anybody was intentionally killed. Many bullets fell upon the roofs of our houses. I gathered two which had fallen upon my terrace. I believe the simplest explanation is that the troops looked upon this demonstration against the Committee of Union and Progress as the great occasion for a holiday, and the discharge of firearms is the usual Eastern method of celebrating a holiday. April 13 fell upon Easter Tuesday, old style, and while Eastern Christians had been celebrating the great feast by furious discharge of pistols on the Sunday and Monday, the Turkish soldier seemed to feel that on Tuesday was his chance of the same kind of amusement.

I suppose that the correct description of what happened on the Tuesday would be a military mutiny. It was even a greater surprise to the majority of the population of the capital than had been the Revolution in July of the previous year. Rifaat Pasha, who had been Ambassador in London, and before reaching Constantinople had visited the courts of each of the great European Powers, could only describe the event as "a bomb." On the Tuesday evening it was stated that neither he nor any other member of the cabinet then in power under Hilmi had in the least suspected any movement by the troops. The army had been demoralised by the Revolution. Politics were discussed with as much freedom in the barrack-room as they were outside, and while a majority of the troops had been ardent supporters of the Committee, there was an active minority who looked askance at it and wished to get back to the absolutism of Abdul Hamid.

Nazim Pasha, the Minister of War under Kiamil, deserves notice. He had checked the discussion of politics in the troops under his command and was bent on reforming the discipline of the army. Things had got very bad when he took charge of the War Department. Men had to be coaxed to go to drill, and behaved disrespectfully to their officers. He had the confidence of the Committee and the nation.

The incident of his return to Constantinople is worth telling. He was a soldier who had studied at Saint Cyr, and apparently looked upon all political questions from a military point of view. But on account of his independence he had fallen under the displeasure of Abdul Hamid, who had kept him in prison for seven years in Erzinghian, in the remote Eastern portion of the empire, as a political suspect. During five of those years he had been confined to a room about ten feet square. The idea of Abdul Hamid or of someone else was to get rid of him. His gaoler is stated to have ostentatiously left a loaded revolver upon his table, but Nazim had too much confidence in his future to commit suicide.

In June, a month preceding the Revolution, he escaped

from prison, and made his way mostly on foot and in various disguises to Batoum. When he reached that place he heard the great news that revolution had broken out in Constantinople. He was without money, but he applied, as so many hundreds of political refugees have done, to an Englishman in Batoum who knew and cared nothing about politics, but believed the tale told him, and furnished a good round sum of money to pay for telegrams to Constantinople and for his passage thither. His escape was hailed with pleasure by the Committee, and on his arrival in the Bosphorus he was welcomed both by its members and the army in general. When Kiamil ceased to be Grand Vizier the Committee objected to Nazim continuing in office as War Minister because of his appointment by Kiamil. It was one of the first of the blunders made by the Committee. Nazim was rapidly improving the discipline in the army, and on his dismissal the old laxity of discipline returned. The soldier translated the word "hurriet" as according him liberty to obey or disobey as he liked, and the demonstration of April 13 was largely the result of this laxity.

There were other contributory causes to the demonstration against the Constitution. The general cry was that the Committee had done nothing. It is true that the wretched passport system had been abolished and that the army of spies had been disbanded. But there was an impatience for results which, though natural, was not justifiable. The Moslem populace was under the belief that the fiat of the Government could at once remedy all evils. The financial difficulty was severe. The Law Courts were as corrupt as ever. The hideous murder of a Christian at Beshisktach did much to irritate the Christian population. A Greek was accused of improper conduct to a Turkish woman. The house where he had taken refuge was surrounded and the man was brutally killed without any attempt on the part of the Moslem police to protect him so that his case might be brought before a legal tribunal. I saw the mad excitement of the mob, and can only qualify its action as a clear case of

lynching, which would not have happened if the accused person had been a Moslem. I said as much at the time to one of the Turkish Ministers. The reply was that I was quite right, but that "just as Americans could not keep cool when a similar charge was brought against a negro, so Moslems could not and would not stand the slightest interference with their women. It was race prejudice, and there was an end of it."

It is also fair to say that in the interval between July and April 13 the Committee had not yet gathered sufficient strength to do what it liked. It gave orders which it could not carry out. For example, a line of steamers known as the *Mahsusie*, belonging to the Government, and running between Stambul and the Princes' Islands, was generally recognised at the time of the Revolution as being under wretched management. The Committee determined to change this, and the wretched steamers were to be replaced by others belonging to a local company. But the employ  es of the *Mahsusie* simply said, "We shall run the steamers, no matter what you say." And they kept their word. From the same wharf, and at the same time, two boats started for the same places, one chartered by the Government, the other belonging to the Government and running against its orders. The Committee dared not employ force against its own men.

The porters of Constantinople belong to a guild or *esnaf*, and had a monopoly for the loading and discharging of ships, the price being fixed by the *esnaf*. Some of the stories told of the absolute power exercised by the porters had their ludicrous side. Seated on a pile of merchandise upon a lighter, the chief of the *esnaf*, a great burly fellow in the ordinary dress of a coal-heaver, sat as a Lord Chancellor may have sat five hundred years ago on his woolsack. No Lord Chancellor ever known to me could possibly have advanced his decisions in a more lordly, dogmatic, unappealable way than did this chairman of the guild of porters. The price to be paid for the discharge of such a ship was so much. If any objection were raised the answer was, "Discharge will not take place at anything less," and from

that decision there was no appeal. The members of the Committee of Union and Progress, all comparatively educated men, saw the disorganisation of commerce which the monopoly of the *esnaf* produced, and recognised especially that it brought down upon them the hostility of every Embassy whose subjects were annoyed and injured by the detention of ships and the refusal to allow their cargo to be discharged. Ultimately the Committee found it necessary greatly to weaken the power of the *esnaf*, and to yield to the representations of the Powers that merchants should be allowed in certain eventualities to employ other porters than those who belonged to the guild.

But that result had not been obtained on April 13, 1909. The truth was that divisions in the Committee had already arisen. A section of its members were conveniently called 'nationalists.' Their avowed desire was to abolish all legal distinctions between all members of the Turkish or Osmanli community, that is, between all subjects of the Sultan. They wished to make of these subjects a nation which should be one in language. The immediate object which they appeared to have in view was to Turkify everything. Now through all time the peoples of Asia Minor have been at least bi-lingual, and until the Revolution its public notices and even shop advertisements were usually printed in four languages—Turkish, Greek, Armenian, and French. The names of the streets were printed in Turkish and French. The notices for the payment of taxes were in Turkish, but usually with an explanation in one or two other languages. The Committee determined to change all this, and would have no language but Turkish. It should be the language of the school, and at first some of the members even proposed that no other language but Turkish should be taught. Finally this decision was modified into the requirement that the study of Turkish should be compulsory in every school. The names of the streets were ordered to be put up only in Turkish characters.

I think it may fairly be said that in most cities in Turkey not one-twentieth part of the population can read Turkish

The regulation, therefore, was recognised as inconvenient. My summer residence has been for upwards of thirty years in the island of Prinkipo, about ten miles from the capital. Excluding foreigners, at least nine-tenths of the inhabitants are Greeks, and out of such nine-tenths I doubt whether one person in twenty can read Turkish letters. Hitherto the names had been put up either in Greek or in Roman characters. We could all read them, and of course no one would have objected to putting them up also in Turkish. But in the new-born zeal of fanatics for nationalisation, the old signboards must be pulled down and the names printed up only in Turkish characters.

It is curious to note that the same narrowness in attempting to force the language of the ruling race on others exists in Hungary. Ask a question in German of a person in the streets of Buda-Pesth and no reply will be given, though the person questioned knows German. Ask it in French and probably a polite reply will be given. The names of the streets there also are only written in Magyar.

The pettifogging tyranny of the National Party would have been tolerated if it confined itself to matters like insisting upon Turkish in schools and the change of names. But Kiamil Pasha was far too moderate in his aims to please the nationalist section, and accordingly they commenced a series of attacks upon him in the Chamber of Deputies, openly stating that the Grand Vizier whom they wanted was one who should be their nominee, and do only what the Committee directed. When a carefully-planned attack in the Chamber was launched against Kiamil, Achmed Riza, the President of the Chamber, who had hitherto leaned towards the Moderate Party, made a *volte face*. On that day he allowed the reading of a declaration from a large body of naval officers who stated that they would refuse to obey the newly appointed Minister of Marine.

A few days later it was currently reported that the officers of the fleet claimed to elect their own Minister of Marine. Kiamil, already upwards of eighty years of age, was driven out of office by the Nationalist Party of the

Committee. When he retired, Jemal-eddin, the enlightened Sheik-ul-Islam, resigned. The dominant section of the Committee begged him to remain in office and Hilmi Pasha joined in the request, but the Sheik-ul-Islam refused. From what I had seen of him on various occasions I concluded that he was an able, thoughtful, essentially liberal-minded Mahometan ; that not only did he believe that Islam owed its great successes to its doing justice to the Christians who were subdued, but that he honestly believed that it was the duty of Moslems to treat Christians as brethren. I do not pretend that this view is generally taken by the leaders of Moslem thought, but that it is adopted by some of the most learned and thoughtful among them is, I am sure, quite true.

But Jemal-eddin was a scholar, a student, and an old man, and I think probably his resignation was due to the fact that he could not allow his name to be associated with the intolerance that was marking the Nationalist Party in reference to language, or with any system involving the wrangle of political parties. I wrote of him in the month of May, 1909, that on each of the occasions when I had seen him I "was struck by his intelligence, reasonableness, and liberality in reference to the relations between Moslems and non-Moslems, and in his firm belief in the duty to establish constitutional government."

Before the outbreak on April 13 it became evident that a portion of the ulema was dissatisfied with the action of the Committee. There had been wild and unreasonable talk even about religious liberty and equality, and this naturally offended the average Mahometan, whose traditions led him to look with suspicion upon the teaching and conduct of Christians. Two or three weeks before the demonstration of the 13th, the Mahometan League was formed. It held its first great meeting in St. Sophia. The Moderate Party was sufficiently numerous to prevent any serious declarations by the Nationalist Party, and the general Moslem opinion was strongly in favour of the Constitution. But in a sermon preached on the eve of the day of the revolt, by a too-zealous hodja in the Sultana Valida mosque, the preacher denounced

the idea of liberty and equality, which, as he declared, had been promulgated in the streets and in the Chamber. But the congregation, as I was told by one who had been present, shewed their hostility to the hodja's opinion very unmistakably. The organ of the League already mentioned declared that "to plot against the Constitution would be treason to Islam," and invoked the curse of heaven upon all such traitors.

The truth was that the Nationalist section had managed to alienate large portions of the community. Some of that section proposed the abrogation of the privileges which the Christian Churches have enjoyed for four centuries and a half. I regret to say that up to the present moment the alienation between the Young Turks and both the Greek and Armenian section continues. Other members suggested that the capitulations under which Europeans have lived since the Middle Ages should be abolished. This suggestion was not put forward in a formal manner until, I believe, 1914, when, owing to the profound ignorance among most people connected with the British Embassy in Constantinople and the department of the Foreign Office which deals with it, a weak, though partial, assent was given to it. Later on, after the great European War was declared, the Turkish Government, still under the Committee of Union and Progress, formally declared the capitulations abolished. Of course, as they are treaties signed between Turkey and other European Powers, the declaration of one party cannot put an end to them.

Before April 13, 1909, the Committee had come to attribute to itself the right to appoint and to dismiss Ministers. Under the violent partisanship of Achmed Riza, whose great suavity of manner could not conceal from the public his determination to support the Committee through thick and thin, the reputation of the Committee and of the Chamber diminished greatly. The week before the 13th, namely, on the 7th, a certain Hassan Fehmi, editor of a Turkish newspaper called the *Sebesti*, was murdered. Two other persons had been murdered in the

streets of Stambul some weeks earlier, both connected with journals opposed to the Committee; but as the two were supposed to be spies, their death attracted little attention. It was different, however, with Fehmi. The one charge alleged against him was that his paper had opposed the Nationalist section. Rightly or wrongly, the impression got abroad that all these three murders had been done at the instigation of the Committee. Popular judgment asked whether the country was to be under a régime of assassination conducted by an anonymous court. The murder was not only a crime, but if perpetrated by the Committee's orders a blunder of the worst kind.

Now let me briefly relate what went on in Salonica on the same April 13. The demonstration in the capital was a surprise to the members of the Committee in that city. Some persons in favour of the movement had obtained possession of the telegraph office, and it was not until the evening that the city was startled with the news of what had gone on. The long and short of the news was that the capital was in possession of the reactionaries. Thereupon the Committee held a meeting at which nearly every member in Salonica was present. The great doubt amongst its members was how the army stationed in Macedonia and under the command of Shevket Pasha would act. Mahmud Shevket was called, and in simple, soldier-like fashion told the Committee that he had sworn to defend the Constitution and would respect his oath. He was wisely trusted, and immediately prepared to march upon the capital. After two days he was joined by Mukhtar Pasha, who after his escape had gone by steamer to Athens and then doubled back to Salonica in order to return to Constantinople.

Members of the Committee who had gone into hiding gradually came forward, and most of them appeared at San Stefano, ten miles from the city. Their number increased daily, and we in the city heard regularly of new men coming from their hiding-places. We heard also vague rumours of measures taken by the reactionary party to

oppose the army from Salonica, which we already knew had commenced its march. One of the most persistent of these rumours was that the army division in Adrianople would oppose the march to the city. Soon we learnt that the men of that division had joined what we may call the Army of Deliverers.

The days between the 14th and the 23rd were full of disquietude and alarm. We could not believe that the demonstration of the 13th was a mere idle spectacle, and that the number of troops in the city, certainly not less than 40,000, possessed of cannon and otherwise well armed, would permit the entry of the Deliverers without a struggle. During these days a number of troops under officers in favour of the Committee assembled at San Stefano and gave their protection to what was spoken of as the National Assembly, consisting of members of the Senate and of the Chamber of Deputies. The Assembly published a proclamation by Mahmud Shevket, promising protection to all law-abiding citizens and threatening punishment to the mutineers. The situation was a curious one. Persons were allowed to go without let or hindrance to San Stefano, and we learned that gradually a large semi-circle of troops was being formed around the city, stretching from San Stefano as far as Ortakewi, thus, including the sea, girdling all Stambul, Pera, Galata, Yildiz, and the several barracks around it. We all anticipated something very unusual, but especially a struggle between the troops that had made the demonstration and those under Shevket.

On the Friday night a bold movement was made by the Deliverers. I first learned of it from a trustworthy hamal in my service, an old Turk whom at any time I would have entrusted with my life. At six o'clock on Saturday morning he came to Pera to inform me that there was no cause for anxiety, because the authorities had given the strictest orders that no person whatever, Moslem or Christian, was to be molested, but that the city was in the hands of soldiers. After a hasty breakfast I went out to see what I could. A great road passes my house, along which foot

passengers were free to go in either direction, but at every street corner which led from it two sentries were stationed with fixed bayonets, with instructions to let no person enter or go out without a pass from the officers. I directed my course down to my chambers along the road followed by the tramway. When I wished to pass from it into the street where my chambers are situated, "Yasak" was at once pronounced. Happily, in a few minutes an officer passed who knew me and guaranteed that I was not a revolutionary. At the back of my house is a Turkish cemetery, and near it were stationed two Greeks, volunteers in the Deliverers' army. We gave them coffee, which was very welcome, and finding them in high spirits and ready to talk, they explained how they and their companions had been told off in different directions for picketing Stambul, Galata, and Pera.

I may mention an incident here which I must ever associate with this day. Miss Alice Gardiner, of Newnham College, Cambridge, had been during the previous week or ten days an almost daily visitor at our house, and was always warmly welcomed by my wife and daughter. She had brought with her a younger lady who I believe also occupied some position in Newnham, who had delighted us all by the keenness of interest which she took in the archæology of the city. When she came she looked the picture of health, but unfortunately she caught some kind of fever, I believe, and was wisely taken to be nursed in our excellent British hospital under the charge of Dr. McLean. Her illness had become very grave on the Wednesday and Thursday, and Miss Gardiner had spent nearly all her time in attendance upon her, coming, however, to our house for tea and to report upon her condition. We were anxious to learn how she was on the Saturday morning, and I succeeded, after considerable difficulty, in visiting her hotel. We then learned from Miss Gardiner that her charge had passed away at dawn, that she had been with her until the end, and then, on leaving the hospital to go to her hotel, had been stopped by Turkish soldiers. Happily the officer spoke a little French, and she was able to explain why she was out in the streets at that

time. He treated her with kindness, but urged her to go at once to the hotel, remarking that this was not a time when civilians should be in the streets.

In the meantime the air was full of rumours which informed us that the encircling ring was gradually drawing nearer and nearer. Besides large numbers of disaffected troops in the town, a regiment in the Selimieh barracks at Scutari was said to be determined to resist the Deliverers, and, if need be, to fire across the Bosphorus upon Pera. All traffic by water was suspended. No caique even was permitted to ply without an express police pass. Meantime, the troops during the night pressed nearer towards Yildiz and the barracks in its neighbourhood, the two most important of which are the Tashkislâ, and the Artillery Barracks at the Taxim. There are also smaller ones around the Sultan's palace at Yildiz. At dawn the Salonica army entered Shishli, only about a mile distant from the public garden of the Taxim. We in Pera heard the sound of firing, which to unaccustomed ears did not sound different from that which we had heard during any of the preceding days. Meantime, artillery, infantry, and cavalry were advancing to take possession of strong positions. The Deliverers were in full marching order and made short work of any opposition. They were permitted to pass the Military School, the Tashkislâ and Artillery Barracks, with little opposition. But a stand was made at the end of Pera High Street. A great deal of desultory firing took place, a few were killed, several wounded. Amongst the men who were wounded was Mr. Moore, a well-known newspaper correspondent. We were all astonished at the small amount of opposition which the Deliverers encountered. It is true that many houses where the contest was keenest were marked with bullet holes, but not many people were injured. By noon we all believed that Pera was in the hands of the Deliverers.

We learned afterwards that a regiment of soldiers which had taken part in the demonstration had been lured into the city in the early morning from the Daoud Pasha barracks, about a mile outside the Adrianople gates, that a detachment

of the Deliverers' army seized their barracks in their absence, that a fight had taken place when its occupants returned, and that a few were killed. The army marching upon Pera let us know that it meant business by the movement of its cannon and the rattle of its machine guns. The Harbia was converted into a military hospital, and I saw many tramcars taking wounded men to it, who were attended amongst others by Dr. Clemow, the physician to the British Embassy. Nearly a hundred men were so taken to the hospital. The longest resistance was made at the Tashkisle barracks, which were bombarded by a battery of field guns from the parade ground of the military school which almost adjoins the Harbia. Between nine and ten o'clock in the morning a sortie took place from Yildiz, but by noon all firing had ceased. The Artillery Barracks had surrendered, and it was believed that the Tashkisle had done the same. Thereupon great numbers of sightseers flocked into the streets, which indeed soon became crowded.

To the surprise of everybody, Tashkisle, however, had not surrendered, and had not been examined, and about three in the afternoon more shots were required and a rush with the bayonet to effect its complete surrender. I went out with the crowd to see what damage was done, and at about half-past four met two English ladies who had incautiously gone into the streets too soon. They had been caught between two fires, one from the Tashkisle barracks, and the other from the Deliverers' troops. Their position was a serious one, but happily a kindly Armenian, occupying one of the houses near, saw them, and invited them into his house. They gladly accepted his invitation, and one of them having a considerable gift for clever sketching, drew an interesting picture of the attack as she saw it from the roof of the Armenian house. When we met them and they recounted their adventures it was impossible not to make the observation that we English were not unnaturally called the "delli," or mad English. One of them wrote a charming account of her adventures, to which a bad reproduction of her clever sketch added interest.

Nothing further happened on this Saturday, but in the meantime three of us were rendering such assistance as we could to Miss Gardiner for the interment of her friend. There are two burial-places for British subjects in Constantinople, the most interesting of which is of course the Crimean cemetery at Scutari. There Miss Gardiner determined that her friend should lie. Mr. Eyres, the Consul-General, made arrangements with the Minister of Police, permitting a steam-launch to cross the Bosphorus; and a bright Presbyterian, eminent already as a biblical scholar, who was destined shortly to become a victim to illness, undertook to conduct the service. We three, together with Miss Gardiner and two of the nurses, accompanied the body across the Bosphorus, and as we passed the great Selimieh barracks, the barracks which will always be associated with the labours of Florence Nightingale, observed men outside it who wore the yellow fez of the Albanians and therefore belonged to the Army of Deliverers.

The journey was not altogether without risk, because of the threat which had been openly made that the occupants of these barracks would fire upon any barracks or other places on the European shore occupied by the Turks from Salonica. At the cemetery, which is near the barracks, we were happily informed by one of the keepers that during the morning parties of two or three soldiers had been quitting the barracks and stealing away to the open country behind it, presumably men who were deserting from the army of reaction. When the service was concluded we had to return by the same route as that by which we had come, and then saw to our surprise that the barracks had been taken possession of by the Deliverers.

A diary of recent events in Constantinople, published in June, 1899, in *Blackwood's Magazine*, and unsigned, though I think I recognise the writer, estimates that on the previous day between four and five hundred men were killed, and between seven and eight hundred wounded. During the Sunday, or perhaps even on Saturday, the supply of gas and water had been cut off from Yildiz. On the Monday the

Army of Deliverers took up a position round that palace. No fighting, however, took place. A great crowd had passed from it which is described thus by the writer in *Blackwood's Magazine*: "Among them were men of all ranks, classes, and ages : pashas, eunuchs, grooms, scullions, spies, and the general scourings and sweepings of the hated palace ; grey-beards and youths ; men in old Turkish costumes and men in European dress ; Turks, Jews, negroes, and one knew not what—all in a truly pitiable state of exhaustion and terror, covered with dust and perspiration after their tramp, by a long detour from Yildiz to Shishli, and thence to the Military School at Pancaldi, into which they were marched. Many were only partially dressed, and all had evidently been packed off just as they were seized. One Pasha—the First Tufenkdji, or head of the personal bodyguard of the Sultan—had been put in a small country carriage, in which he lay back, half fainting. Another was on horseback with a boot on one foot only. Later they were transferred to the Galata Serai Prison, in the heart of Pera, and thence to Stambul."

CHAPTER XIX

ABDUL HAMID DEPOSED

Enver's Significant Words—A New Era—A Precipitated *Coup*—The Sultan's Attitude—The National Assembly Decide Upon Deposition—Abdul Hamid Informed—He Pleads for His Life—His Cowardice—Mahomet V.—Abdul Hamid is Packed Off—Refreshing the Harem—The New Sultan Proclaimed—A Kindly Man—Defying Abdul Hamid—Turkish Misrule—Fostering Religious Hatred—The Caliphate—The Jihad—Bribes for Reactionaries.

ON the Sunday about fifty of the Army of the Deliverers, killed in the previous day's fighting, were buried, and received a public funeral. Each coffin was covered by a Turkish flag and bore a fez on a small stick at one end, as is the usual custom. They were all interred in a common grave on land which adjoins that possessed by the English High School for Girls, and with much religious ceremony. Patriotic speeches were delivered by Enver Bey, as he then was, and others. A handsome monument has since been erected over the grave, and the spot is called the Hill of Liberty. Enver especially emphasised in his speech that Moslems and Christians were lying side by side in token that they, living or dying, were henceforward fellow-patriots who would know no distinction of race or creed.

It is worth while to mention that the occupation of Constantinople by Shevket's army on the Saturday took place twenty-four hours before it was intended. This was because trustworthy information had reached Shevket that

a massacre of Armenians in Stambul was contemplated. The deputies and foreigners at the Military Schools were also marked down for assassination. The civil authorities communicated with San Stefano the fact that a number of Kurds of the lowest class, with which Stambul then abounded, were to be the instruments in these outrages. The Kurds at the Scrkeji railway station, who had been brought to Constantinople after the massacre of Armenians in the city, were observed on the Friday to be greatly excited. A train with one hundred and fifty soldiers was promptly sent to the station, arrested several Kurds and soundly thrashed all who opposed them. The general advance was then expedited and so the conspiracy was nipped in the bud.

A more ruffianly set of savages than the Kurds at the central railway station in Stambul at that time I have never seen. They brought with them from Armenia the worst of reputations. Many of them had taken part in the massacres, the lootings, and the outrages upon women which marked the work of Abdul Hamid. Moslems as well as Christians expressed their horror that such men should have been brought into Constantinople. Hence when the rumour was spread that arrangements had been made—which we all rightly or wrongly attributed to Abdul Hamid—that the Kurds were to be given a free hand, every respectable inhabitant hoped and prayed for the immediate entry of Shevket's army. Of all the stupidities which characterised the party of reaction from April 13 to the deposition of Abdul, this was probably the worst, for it alienated such of his Moslem supporters as would have been indisposed to dethroning him.

Constantinople having been captured, the immediate work before the Committee was to decide upon the fate of the Sultan. His attitude since the 13th had been remarkable. He had issued no orders that were made public. He had apparently given no sign of life. "Was it conceivable," everyone asked, "that the great demonstration was without his consent?" The commonest question asked in reply, which is the usual Eastern way of answering, was, "Who

can benefit by getting rid of the Committee of Union and Progress?" For the moment its blunders were forgotten, and few, if any, thought the demonstration was not intended for the benefit of Abdul Hamid. Whether he had any directing hand in the attempt at counter revolution is difficult to say. It is beyond doubt that the soldiers who demonstrated had abundance of loose money, and knowing that the Sultan had a considerable sum stored up at Yildiz, the general belief was that the large supply of small money came from that place. The only other persons from whom it may have come were a few of the highly-placed servants of Abdul Hamid. He was so disliked amongst the community generally, that I doubt whether any of them would have subscribed freely, even according to Turkish ideas, to support him.

All things considered, I think it is probable that he furnished a considerable sum of money. That he should be willing to favour the demonstration made against the Committee is reasonable enough, but never, in any country, have I seen so foolish an attempt at a political movement as was that of April 13. There were a few officers of neither position nor ability with the free-shooting soldiers, but there was no one who even assumed command of them, and Abdul Hamid apparently remained quietly at Yildiz awaiting events, willing to risk a certain sum of money, but either incapable or unwilling to give direction to the movement. It was an abortive attempt which gave the finishing stroke to the supposition that he possessed any particle of statesmanship.

Naturally the Committee held him responsible for the outbreak, and their first duty, therefore, was to consider what should be done with him. The National Assembly met and seriously considered the question. There were a few in favour of having him killed. The majority took a more sensible view. They knew him better than did the visitors of various nations who left Yildiz with the impression that they had met a man, and recognised that so long as he lived he would be a security for the Committee rather than a danger. The Committee were careful to follow legal forms,

and though the National Assembly represented all sections of the community, they were careful to consult and obtain the decision of the highest religious court. They applied to the Sheriat for a fetva, and it is worth placing upon record what was the case submitted and what was the response. The question submitted to the Sheik-ul-Islam and the Fetva Eminé was textually as follows :

“ What should be done with a Commander of the Faithful who has suppressed books and important dispositions of the Sheriat Law ; who forbids the reading of and burns such books ; who wastes public money for improper purposes ; who, without legal authority, kills, imprisons, and tortures his subjects, and commits other tyrannical acts ; who, after he has bound himself by oath to amend, violates such oath, and persists in sowing discord, so as to disturb the public peace, thus occasioning bloodshed ?

“ From various provinces the news comes that the population has deposed him ; and it is shewn that to maintain him is manifestly dangerous, and his deposition advantageous.

“ Under such conditions is it permissible for the actual governing body to decide as seems best upon his abdication or deposition ? ”

The answer is the simple word, “ Yes.”

Upon this decision the National Assembly decided with unanimity that Abdul Hamid must be deposed. Having arrived at such resolution at a secret meeting, they selected two members of the Chamber of Deputies and two Senators, Mr. Carasso a deputy and Essad Pasha, a Senator, being both prominent men among them, who were to inform Abdul Hamid of their decision. I know Carasso well, and Essad slightly, and Carasso kindly came round the next day at my invitation to give me an account of what passed. The four delegates went to Yildiz, and after several formalities, on their shewing that they were there on a special message to His Majesty from the National Assembly, were ushered into a room which they had time to notice before the Sultan entered. The room was well supplied with

mirrors, so that, as Carasso observed, the Sultan from the place where he was to enter could command a view of everything in it. The Sultan entered, and they made the customary salute. Essad Pasha spoke, and informed His Majesty that they were there at the request of the National Assembly, and conformably to a fetva such Assembly had pronounced his deposition. Abdul Hamid hesitated, trembling, and then added, "It is Kismet. But will my life be spared?" Thereupon Abdul Hamid lost all his *sang-froid*, and demanded again, before his question could be answered, whether his life would be spared.

Essad replied, "The sentiment of the nation alone can guarantee your life, but personally I believe your Majesty's life is safe."

When the question was repeated, one of the delegates answered that their mission was ended in conveying to His Majesty that he was deposed and his brother appointed.

"But you know," said Abdul Hamid, "what they are going to do with me. Will they kill me?"

Carasso replied that they had no authority to make any statement on that subject.

"But what do you believe? Don't you know that they will kill me?"

"No, your Majesty, we do not know that. The Turkish people are a long-suffering people, and are always disposed to be merciful."

"But why should they kill me? I have had my brother Reshad in my power for thirty-two years, and I let him live. I had Murad also in my power and did not kill him."

Abdul pleaded hard for his life, but the deputation was not able to give him any consolation as to what his ultimate fate might be. After a long pause Abdul cried out, "May the curse of God rest on those who have caused the trouble."

Carasso replied, "*Amin, Amin*. May they be cursed."

Meantime, Abdul's grandson had come to his side, and Galib and Tahir Bey appeared at the door by which the deputies had entered. The deputies then stated that, having made their communication, they wished to leave,

but the Sultan appeared to hesitate to permit their departure. His grandson burst into tears, and the Sultan let fall an expression indicating that he believed he had been deceived into thinking that the proceedings of the Macedonians were bluff.

Finally Abdul Hamid asked where he would be allowed to live. The deputies replied that they knew nothing as to this, on which Abdul expressed his desire that he might be allowed to occupy the Cheragan palace. Upon this the deputation left the room.

Carasso stated that the presence of the child at this interview gave it a peculiarly pathetic character.

Meantime Reshad Effendi, as he was generally called, was informed that he had become Sultan, and took the title of Mahomet V. On the night of the same Tuesday the 27th a few motor-cars and carriages drew up at Yildiz, took possession of the deposed Sultan and a number of ladies of his harem, and drove off quietly to the railway station well guarded by troops. A special train had been prepared for him. But the arrangements were otherwise clumsily managed. Persons who happened to be at the station told the story of the ladies of the harem having nothing to eat or drink. They had been roused up in the middle of the night, and only had time to take a small quantity of clothes when they were bundled into the carriages. Happily at the refreshment-room in the station simple provisions were obtainable by those who had money to pay for them, but one of the attendants was asked by the ladies to tell His Majesty that they had nothing to eat and no money with which to pay for food. His Majesty was able to supply their need, and towards three in the morning the train steamed off to Salonica. Abdul Hamid had ceased to reign.

As already mentioned, the successor of Abdul Hamid was appointed on Tuesday, April 27, 1909. I was out of doors early on that day in anticipation of a public ceremony. During the night all the mosques had been secured, and I observed that great numbers of officers were passing from

Pera to Stambul, for the National Assembly was to meet at eight o'clock. At half-past ten cartridges were distributed to the troops outside the portico of the Yeni Jami mosque. By eleven o'clock the main thoroughfares of the city were blocked and access cut off by soldiers. Shortly afterwards watching from the roof of the great building of the Public Debt Department, I saw both the bridges across the Golden Horn cleared of the crowd, and at the same time the great thoroughfare leading to the Scrkeji landing-place on the Stambul shore, also cleared, was lined with troops. At half-past twelve a battery of guns was moved into the square on the south side of St. Sophia, the ancient Augusteum, the site of many picturesque historical scenes in the city's history. The battery and troops were there for the protection of the Chamber of Deputies, which was now sitting for the first time since the outbreak of April 13. Soon afterwards a Salonica regiment, largely composed of Albanians, came from Galata and formed up at Scrkeji. Then boomed out the first of the fateful hundred and one guns announcing the accession of a new Sultan. The roofs, the houses, and streets were all crowded with people: Moslems and Christians alike expressed their joy by a general clapping of hands. The guns resounded at half-minute intervals and each report was followed by applause from tens of thousands of hands. The sound resembled a sudden rainfall upon a set of drums, and was at once singular and invigorating.

Then from my point of vantage I saw three steam-launches coming from the direction of Beshiktash, only a quarter of a mile farther up the Bosphorus than Abdul Hamid's palace of Dolma Bagsche. They arrived at the landing-place of Scrkeji, where many attendants and several Ambassadors and Ministers, among whom was the British, were gathered together. A procession was then formed which made its way towards the Chamber of Deputies and St. Sophia. The new ruler was saluted all along the route with hand-clapping and cheering more vigorous than ever. There could be no mistaking the signs of popular rejoicing.

Mahomet V., as Mahomet Reshad Effendi chose to be proclaimed, is the younger brother of the deposed Abdul Hamid, both being the sons of Abdul Medjid, who died in 1861. He was born in 1844. He has always been remarkable for his unassuming and gentle character, but of education in the usual sense of the word he never had a chance. Ever since Abdul Hamid's sudden accession to power in 1876 he was kept under close surveillance. All his entourage, beginning with the ladies of the harem and ending with the scullions, were nominees of Abdul Hamid and acted as his spies. Mahomet V. shewed his kindliness by refusing to accept the proposal of the Young Turks to dismiss the members of his household and to have others of his choice, alleging that if he did so they would be deprived of all means of livelihood. On the sole occasion when I could have a good look at him, and on which he sent me a courteous message, I was impressed with his kindliness. He is said to belong to the sect of Dervishes known as Mehlevis, and I can well believe it. Piety is stamped upon his countenance as it is upon so many adherents of the great pietistic body. Had it been his fate to be born in England or Scotland, he would have been a churchwarden or an Elder, chosen, not for his worldly knowledge or ability, but for his simple goodness of heart. I do not know whether the various rumours that have been telegraphed on several occasions to Europe, to the effect that he wishes to abdicate, are true or not. But I am quite sure that if they are, the Turkish Government is wise in praying him to remain on the throne.

There were features about the attempt at reaction which are worthy of notice. In the first place there were no signs amongst the civil population of discontent with the Committee. The demonstration was made by the troops alone. It is true that among the troops were men disguised as ulema who clamoured for the Sacred Law. There were also some softas, some of whom possibly had been bought, but others who had been carried away by the fervour of religious fanaticism. The cry of "Religion in danger" appealed to

them. The wonder to me then and now is that more were not carried away by this cry. The slight response which it received was proof of what I have elsewhere maintained, that there has been a real diminution, especially in the capital, of religious fanaticism.

This was, in fact, the most remarkable feature of the movement. Hitherto Turkish risings, whether in the capital or in the provinces, had always been marked by outbreaks of Moslem fanaticism. A valuable but well-nigh forgotten book by the Rev. Dr. Walsh, Chaplain of the British Embassy in Constantinople during several years between 1820 and 1830, gives very vivid pictures which shew how readily hostility between the races became struggles between Moslem and Christian. It was the period in which the Patriarch was hanged at his own gate, of the massacre of Chios, of a condition of things in Smyrna when every Moslem who had a gun was prepared to shoot at sight any Christian. It is almost inconceivable, even to those like myself who have lived long in Turkey, to mark the diminution of fanaticism in western Turkey. In the events of 1909 in Constantinople there was not a sign of it. There was ostentatious friendship between Moslems and Christians. We knew of course that deep down in the heart of the Moslem peasant there were depths of fanaticism. This was shewn in the murder of a Greek already mentioned for having been found trying to make love to a Turkish woman. But the widespread character of the tyranny of Abdul Hamid had been a contributory cause to the silencing of fanaticism. His treatment of Christians was not believed to be due to zeal for religion. The man in the street believed that it was largely owing to the fact that Abdul himself was of Armenian blood. Happily there were other and more hopeful contributory causes.

The Moslem community in Turkey is largely led by the chiefs of the ulema. I have already mentioned that the Sheik-ul-Islam, at the time of the Revolution until the attempt at reaction, was essentially a liberal-minded man, and my interviews with him and others who were near him convinced

ne that they would have no sympathy with a fanatical ising. The fact that the cry for the Sheriat, "Religion in danger," even when coupled with "Down with the Committee!" fell upon unwilling ears, shewed great progress in Moslem public opinion. This was recognised generally. Accordingly one of the first acts of the Commander-in-Chief, Shevket Pasha, after he had shipped off Abdul Hamid, was publicly and formally to thank the ulema for their loyal support. If at the supreme moment of danger they had supported the cry of "Religion in danger," the mutiny might have succeeded in bringing about a bloody struggle in the streets of the capital.

The Sheik-ul-Islam who was in power on April 13 was not the one with whom I had the interviews, but another who was appointed upon his advice, for, in accordance with Moslem usage, when Mahomet V. was proclaimed a new Sheik had to be and was appointed. He, however, belonged to the same liberal school of Moslem theology.

A story regarding the new Sheik-ul-Islam, named Sahib Mollah, is worth telling. During the reign of Abdul Hamid he had proved himself a man. He had been sounded on the question as to whether he could change the order of succession. It will be remembered that the Khedive Ismail had succeeded in obtaining an imperial firman changing the order of succession to the throne of Egypt from the Asiatic to the European mode. It was natural that the Sultan should wish to make such a change applicable to Turkey, so that his own son might come to the throne—an event which cannot happen unless at least a dozen persons belonging to the imperial family who are older than he should predecease him. The Sheik-ul-Islam boldly replied that such a change could not in conformity with the religious law be accepted, a decision not to the mind of the Sovereign.

But, on what Abdul Hamid probably considered a more important occasion, Sahib Mollah had shewn his independence. When Midhat Pasha was placed upon his trial and convicted of the murder of Abdul Aziz, Sahib Mollah was a member of the tribunal. Great pressure was brought to bear

upon him to consent to the death sentence. Like Sir Henry Elliot and most men who were there at the time, myself included, he believed that the Sultan's death was by suicide and he therefore refused to join in the conviction of Midhat, and was the only judge who would not bow to Abdul Hamid's menaces. For this resistance he fell and remained in disgrace with the Sultan. This was well known in the capital, and it was not surprising that his sympathies had been with the Young Turks since they formed their Committee. His appointment as head of the Moslem hierarchy met with general approval, and this although his reputation was far from being as high as that of his predecessor.

I have written during the last forty years many hard things regarding Moslem fanaticism in Turkey, and, speaking generally, I see no reason whatever to retract anything. It has been the greatest hindrance to the fusion of the races of the empire, and so long as it exists and is uncontrolled, equality or fraternity are not possible. It was and is a bar to all progress. It depopulated great portions of Asia Minor, and reduced populous cities to mere villages. Above all, it saturated the ignorant peasantry with the idea of dominancy and a spiritual conceit which rendered them impervious to any education which would improve their lot. They had a divine right to lord it over their Christian fellow-subjects, and if the latter became rich, which they constantly did on account of their greater intelligence, industry and better education, the Moslems were ever ready at the command of the agents of Government to despoil their neighbours and to commit wholesale massacres.

It should never be forgotten that the whole period of Turkish misrule, since the capture of Constantinople in 1453, is a period during which Moslem supremacy existed by means of periodical massacres. The Moslem villagers, naturally kind and hospitable, once questions arose which appealed to their religious prejudices, shewed the worst features of their character. But here in 1909 the Young Turkey party repressed the serious attempt at reaction just

as they had brought about the Revolution nine months earlier, not only without any appeal whatever to religious animosity, but with the strong support of the chiefs of the Moslem community. Turkey had travelled far when it had got away from the fanaticism of less than a century ago to such a stage. When their enemies spoke of the Committee consisting of Jews, atheists, and freemasons, they were either willingly perverse or ignorant or forgetful of the condition of feeling existing between Moslems and Christians in the first half of last century.

The efforts of Abdul Hamid had always been directed towards increasing the hostility between Moslems and Christians. This desire shewed itself in his efforts to have himself recognised as Caliph. The word signifies vicegerent. The tradition in Islam remained for nine hundred years that there should be a successor of Mahomet who should exercise the same power over all the faithful throughout the world which Mahomet had claimed during his life. Without entering into the story of many claimants throughout the early centuries of Mahometan history, the office, so far as the Sunni Division of Moslems to which the Turks belong, had come in 1500 to be recognised as vested in the Sherif of Mecca, the Guardian of the Sacred Cities. The occupant of that position in 1516 was in Egypt when the country was conquered by Selim I., the son of Sultan Mahomet the Conqueror. On such conquest the then Sherif of Mecca submitted, and the Sultan took the title of Guardian of the Sacred Cities. Subsequent Sultans have always preserved the title, and called themselves caliphs. They have, however, never been recognised in Morocco, Tunis, and Algiers. Such a pretension is unknown among the great Mahometan division of the Shiah. According to them, the Imam or Caliph is almost, if not entirely, an incarnation of Divinity.

As shewing the weakness of this claim, I may mention that the Rev. Dr. Hughes, writing about seven years ago, said, "After a careful study of the whole subject for thirty years, twenty having been spent among the mosques of the

Moslems (in India), I will defy anyone to produce any reasonable proof that any Moslem scholar in India acknowledges Abdul Hamid as the rightful Caliph." It would be easy to mention other authorities, but that of Dr. Hughes is sufficient. He is a writer of authority whose *Dictionary of Islam* is a well-known text book to all interested in the subject. Abdul Hamid made many attempts to strengthen his position as Caliph, and some thirteen or fourteen years ago took a step in Constantinople which occasioned surprise. The qualifications for the office were judged so important, that until that time they were posted up in all the great mosques of Constantinople. The first of them was that he was to belong to the tribe of the Koreish. Another was that the Caliph should be elected. Abdul Hamid did not possess either of these qualifications, not to mention others; he gave orders that these lists of qualifications should be taken down in all the mosques. The action was regarded as an attempt to interfere with sacred teaching. One of the leading mollahs to whom I mentioned the order replied, "Does Abdul Hamid take us to be fools? All of us who are engaged in teaching know them by heart. Does he think that we shall cease to teach them because he has had the notice torn down? The only result will be to make us understand that he knows he is not the Caliph."

Abdul wished his position as Caliph to be distinctly recognised, in order that when he proclaimed the Holy War his Moslem subjects would act as one man because the order came from "the Shadow of God," and Moslems who were not his subjects would join them. During the last thirty years of his reign he constantly expressed his desire for the spread of Islam, and his paid agents both in and out of Turkey had much to say about Pan Islamism. Even in English newspapers, which ought to have been better informed, much was made of this cry. The notion that all Moslems throughout the world would be ready to fight to the death for the cause of a war proclaimed by the Moslem Caliph, suggested horrors that took one back in imagination to the massacres of Bagdad and of the great hordes of

invaders from Central Asia. I have heard again and again that such kind of Holy War was about to be proclaimed, and that we should see terrible, mysterious, and unheard-of results. The Prophet's banner was to be brought out from the famous library of Top Capu in Constantinople, and the enemies of Islam would flee before it.

Probably I heard most of the dire results which were to follow during the Turco-Russian war in 1877-78. But the proclamation had no effect whatever. Everybody will remember that much fuss was made about the proclamation of the Jihad or Holy War in 1914, but the mollahs, as Turkish subjects, were still on friendly terms with the Committee, and were not whole-hearted in making the proclamation. It was so qualified in the declaration that it fell flat, and did not add a soldier to the Turkish army. As I do not wish to say anything more on the subject, either of Holy Wars or of Moslem fanaticism, let me conclude this paragraph by saying that the events of the last six years have had the satisfactory result of shewing the decay of Moslem fanaticism.

In the nine or ten days' interval between April 13 and the deportation of Abdul Hamid, I went about daily in the streets of Constantinople to try and find who were the parties who had favoured the revolutionary movement. My first impression was that the religious caste of the ulema had taken a prominent share in it. They are the leaders of Moslem thought, conservative in habit of mind, and opposed, as such bodies are in all countries, to violent change. I knew that the revolted troops, so far as they had a cry, had declared in favour of the religious law of the Sheri, and had alleged that Mahometanism was in danger. But the cry fell flat, and the few who uttered it were apparently regarded with contempt by their brethren. Amongst the troops it turned out afterwards that there were a few spies disguised as mollahs who tried to raise such a cry, but who were arrested and some of them executed. Nowhere did I find that the cry created any impression. It was from the first disliked, and disowned by the ulema.

I have said that Abdul Hamid remained inactive during the 13th. He lent colour, however, to the belief that the movement was designed by him by issuing a declaration at the end of the day granting an indemnity to the mutineers. It was found that money had been very freely distributed. A well-known reactionary was caught with the sum of £2,700 on him, and the assertion was made that no less than £12,000 was taken from prisoners upon their arrest. Abdul Hamid appointed Tewfik as Grand Vizier, and, still having some organs in the Press which were in his pay, set them to declare that he had no intention of attacking the Constitution. He had played his best to bring about a counter revolution, and had failed. From whatever point of view the plot may be examined, it was a foolish and stupid one.

CHAPTER XX

STRUGGLES OF THE COMMITTEE OF UNION AND PROGRESS

A Question of Responsibility—The Adana Massacre—A Commission of Enquiry—Examining Yildiz Kiosk—Embarrassing Discoveries—Hanging Reactionaries—The C.U.P. Visits France and England—Javad Bey's Mission a Failure—The C.U.P.'s Blunders—Turkifying Everything—A Foolish Boycott—A Secret Struggle—A Jihad that Failed—The Sultan's Progress—A Severe Criticism—Hakki Pasha's Comment—A Struggle for Life—Damat Ferid Pasha—The Dogs of Constantinople—Their Unwritten Laws—A Terrible Fate—Great Fires in Stambul—Young Turks' Vigorous Action—An Insanitary Hospital—Fire Insurance Claims—The Turks and Life Insurance—A New Law—Absurd Clauses—My Drastic Excisions—Decentralisation—A Cumbersome System—The Gendarmerie—The Modern Woman Phase—Miss Isabel Fry's Work.

IT is even yet too soon to speak dogmatically as to the causes of the futile demonstration of April 13, 1909. It was, beyond doubt, intended to strike at the Committee of Union and Progress, and had there been a military leader of ability who would have placed himself at the head of the disaffected soldiers, the result might have been the re-establishment of Abdul Hamid as an Absolute Ruler. But he himself had no such ability, and, with the exception of supplying money, allowed things to drift, with the results which I have mentioned; nor was there a soldier of eminence who cared to espouse his cause. The revolt was almost entirely limited to the capital. But, to say the least, it is a curious coincidence that in several cities in Asia Minor there were similar risings on the same date, suggesting

that there was some kind of organisation. English and other newspapers learnt from their own correspondents of such attempts.

Far and away the most serious was in Adana, the chief town of Cilicia, where serious events occurred which terminated in the massacre of several thousand Armenians. It is no part of my purpose to describe this movement, on which I have commented in *Turkey and its People*. An interesting question in regard to it was, "Had the movement the support of the Committee of Union and Progress or not?" There is hardly any question which in Constantinople has of late years been more fully discussed. We had as British Consul at Adana during that time the brave Colonel Doughty Wylie, who was unfortunately killed as recently as the spring of 1915 at the Dardanelles. He was always reticent on the subject, and probably considered reticence as his duty. But he admitted that the conduct of the Turkish authorities was abominable.

I have had the advantage of discussing the matter, not only with the Armenian Bishop and leading ecclesiastics of the province, but with Lady Rosalind Northcote, who went out as a volunteer nurse to aid the refugee victims whose kinsmen had been killed and their houses burnt; also with Mr. Charles H. Woods, who visited the country, and Dr. Chambers, a much respected Canadian missionary who did splendid work among the fugitives, and with others. I arrived at the conclusion that the Committee in Constantinople strongly disapproved of the outbreak, but that it was actually ordered by certain of the extremists of the Committee in Salonica. Their argument, as stated to me by a clear-headed and well-informed Armenian publicist, was this: the Armenians of Cilicia had joined heartily in the cries for a new Constitution, and had asserted their liberty and equality with Moslems in terms which were unnecessarily offensive. Their cry was that the Moslems had had their turn, now had come that of the Armenians. It was as if slaves had suddenly been set free and made the equals of their masters. That many of them made idle and irritating

boasts is beyond doubt. These were taken up by children and the stupid people amongst the Moslems and Armenians alike, and the result was that when an outcry against the Armenians was raised it led to massacres quite in the style of those between 1895 and 1900.

The Committee were alarmed when they found the result on European opinion. The event had angered their best friends. Subscriptions for the relief of orphans and widows and for the reconstruction of buildings were raised in England and America, and a large committee was formed in Constantinople to administer that relief. Talaat Bey, who has always been prominent among the Young Turkey Party, was President, and several of the leading Europeans of the city, chosen irrespective of religion, together with the leading Armenians, Greeks, and Jews, were members. The committee did much for the relief of the sufferers. On two occasions, in the absence of Talaat Bey, I was unanimously appointed its chairman. The greatest amount of relief, however, was distributed, and in many cases sent directly to Mr. Peet, an American who acts as business manager, banker, and general factotum for all the American missions in Asia Minor, a man of untiring energy and of good business capacity.

A commission was named by the Chamber of Deputies to enquire into the circumstances of the rising in Adana and of the massacres. A much-respected Armenian was named upon it. We all trusted that his report would give us the complete story. Unfortunately, a day or two after his arrival back in Constantinople he died. Nothing inflicted a greater blow upon the fraternal spirit with which the Armenians had entered into common work with the Committee than did these outrages in Cilicia. Two or three of the leading Armenian deputies did their best to stem the current of hostility in their own community against the Committee for what they believed to be its conduct in that province.

My friend Mr. Zohrab, an Armenian deputy of ability with whom I discussed the question very fully at the time,

felt that in the interest of his race it was better not to give prominence to the massacre. Whether they liked it or not Armenians had to live among the Turks, and unless they could continue on good terms with the Committee, the only alternative to a series of new massacres was to make an appeal to be united to Russia. But as Russia up to that time had been curiously narrow in its treatment of the Armenian Church and community, and seemed to wish to have nothing to do with its people, there were very few amongst them who were in favour of such an appeal. The choice, said others, is between massacre and Russia. Hence the general sentiment amongst them was that they must make common cause with the Turks as represented by the Young Turkey Party, and this they continued to do until the outbreak of the war in 1914.

The events of April had so shaken the Committee, that in order that they should remain in power they tried to make a clean sweep of both abuses and opponents. Its leading members strongly supported such action. At the burial of the loyal troops who had been killed in taking possession of Constantinople, Enver had made an impressive speech already quoted insisting that these deaths in the service of a common country ought to unite Moslems, Christians, and Israelites. Shevket, the officer in command, always took up the same line.

The popularity of the British, though not so great as it had been nine months earlier, still continued, especially amongst the troops. An incident occurred which illustrated this. About May 1, 1909, an old merchant captain was buried in the civil side of the British cemetery at Scutari. As the cortège entered the cemetery it passed a body of Macedonian troops who had come with Shevket, and a number of soldiers ranged themselves in orderly fashion on each side and accompanied the body to the grave. Their officer was informed that the deceased was not in the public service. "But," replied he, "he was an Englishman," and the soldiers, in good order so as to convey no alarm

among the mourners, fired over the grave a military salute.

Some lady friends, British and American, had opened a flower mission, keeping the sick and wounded in various hospitals supplied with flowers. Some of them, amongst whom was my own daughter, hesitated at offering flowers to the wounded Turks. They determined, however, to try. They visited a military hospital near St. Sophia where men were being treated for gunshot wounds. They offered each sufferer cigarettes and flowers. Both were gladly accepted, but dear as is the cigarette the flowers seemed still more welcome. One poor fellow, who had already had a leg amputated, clutched at the wallflowers offered, and with sparkling eyes smelled them and then pointed to a glass of water. Instead of drinking it he placed the flowers in it, and would not allow the glass to be taken from him. All cherished the flowers, and thanked Allah for sending them. Many stories were current at the time with reference to Turkish as well as European ladies visiting the hospitals for the first time.

A commission was chosen to examine Yildiz Kiosk after the deposed Sultan had been sent away. Report credited Abdul Hamid with having collected enormous sums of money. His bank-book shewed that he had nearly two millions deposited at the Deutsche Bank. £275,000 was found in cash, together with large stores of diamonds and precious stones, ornaments of silver and gold, and hundreds of cigarette-cases. A large number of bags, each containing £100 in money, and totalling £120,000, were also found. But the most important find at Yildiz was of an immense quantity of what are locally known as "djournals," or the reports of spies. On the first day four waggon-loads of them were taken away to be classified and numbered. One of the ugly features of the examination shewed that several of the reports emanated from Turks of a certain position who now professed to be supporters of the Committee, and had been really traitors to it.

Further examination shewed that many persons had been

tempted by Abdul Hamid's gold to act as his agents, and the general belief is that the examination ceased because, had it continued, the number of spies would have been found to be so great as seriously to lessen those who were willing and had been supporting the Committee. The Committee itself was seriously affected by the reports which had come in from Cilicia, and seemed to fear that a belief should exist that they wished to cover up the atrocities committed there and to leave their authors unpunished. Ferid Pasha, who had now become Minister of the Interior, appeared to be desirous of getting at the truth, and supported the demands of Sir Gerard Lowther and Mr. Leishman, the American Ambassador, for that purpose. We learnt after the dethronement of Abdul Hamid that these demands had produced an excellent effect in Anatolia. A further massacre had been arranged to take place in that part of the empire on April 28, when the firing of a hundred and one guns announced the accession of Mahomet V.

A few days after the official examination of Yildiz the palace and gardens were opened to public inspection. I visited them in company with Sir Bampfylde Fuller, and was struck with the peculiar mixture of tawdriness and magnificence. Each portion of the garden had been and was under the charge of a man who was at once gardener and spy. All to whom I spoke declared that beyond a small section of the garden they knew nothing. The system of espionage outside was carried out thoroughly throughout the buildings and estate. My companion remarked that the general arrangement of the garden, zoological department, and buildings reminded him of what he had often seen in the gardens of native Indian princes.

It was judged necessary by the Committee to hang some of the reactionary leaders in Constantinople. A military court was constituted to try them, and a proposed general amnesty was held over until the courts-martial had completed their task. Nadir Agha, the Chief Eunuch in the service of the Sultan, was one of the first who was hanged. On the next day, Sunday, thirteen suffered the same fate.

Hanging among the Turks takes place in public. The bodies were kept suspended for eight hours, and were thus seen by enormous crowds. Most of the offenders were young, but they included a white-bearded major and twelve non-commissioned officers. All had taken an active part in the rising of April 13. Naturally I went to see some of the men who were hanging. The gallows resembled gypsy tripods on a large scale. They were rigged up with a pulley and tackle, and the bodies hung about three feet from the ground. They had placards on their breasts giving their names, regiments, and crimes. I may remark that, contrary to the belief, that I at least had held, that the cap with which an English murderer's head is covered at the moment of execution was placed there to hide the blackened head, I saw, on the contrary, that the effect of hanging was apparently to draw all blood from the head and render it abnormally white and deathlike.

The leading members of the Committee of Union and Progress paid a visit to France and England in the autumn of 1909. Two influential members had previously visited this country. One was Riza Tewfik and the other a Christian Syrian Arab, named Bistani effendi. Both these are remarkable men. Both are scholars. Riza was known in the Chamber of Deputies as the Philosopher. I have rarely known a man of any nationality who looked on questions with more detachment than he, whether such questions regarded politics, theology, or philosophy. He would discuss the ethics of Christianity as many of my readers have probably heard Japanese scholars discuss them, without reverence or acceptance, but academically, and without indication of a shadow of prejudice. I remember his speaking with me on the question of the Trinity, and he at once condemned the unphilosophic attitude of Moslems who were unable to distinguish between persons and personalities. Of course I had to admit that the latin *persona* only clumsily expressed the intention of the authors of the Christian creeds. He was the only professing Moslem whom I ever met who did not see any philosophical objection to the Triune

conception of Deity. Indeed, it is usually a surprise to Moslems when they learn that the most distinctive creed recited in all the great historical churches, at least once on every Sunday, begins with the assertion, "I believe in *one* God." It is always a delight to discuss matters with so learned, thoughtful, and detached a scholar as Riza Tewfik.

His companion on that occasion, Bistani effendi, is a devout Catholic, a Maronite Catholic. He was educated, I believe, at the Roman Catholic schools in Beyrout, for the Maronites are in union with Rome, and possesses not merely great literary ability but has produced valuable works. His translation of Homer into Arabic is very highly appreciated by the few who are familiar with both languages. He has produced an Arabic encyclopedia, which is far and away the best which exists. To me he was always an interesting scholar. Turkey has a superabundance of religious communities, and I agree with a distinguished Roman prelate who spent many years in the country, that there is no heresy which has ever appeared in the Christian Church which has not its representatives at this time in some portion of the Turkish empire. The subject has always had special interest for me, and on various occasions I have applied to Bistani for explanations as to the tenets of certain obscure sects, and have never found his information wanting.

The deputation from the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate was well received in England. I was on the reception committee, and was present at a lunch given them by the Government. Sir Edward Grey gave them a cordial welcome, and Talaat Bey and another, whose name I forget, replied. The demonstration was useful as emphasising the fact that our country sympathised with the efforts of the Young Turkey Party in endeavouring to govern Turkey on constitutional lines. After the lunch Talaat Bey and I, with two other deputies, attended and spoke at a meeting of the Balkan Committee.

At a later period Javad Bey, the Minister of Finance, came to England. At that time the influence of our country in Turkey had begun to wane, while that of Germany,

presented at Constantinople by Baron Marschall von Lieberstein, was steadily on the increase. Javad was supposed to be the ablest financier that Turkey possessed, and, judging from his public utterances, had conceived the idea that the great States of Europe were eager to advance any money he wished. He went to Paris, having made certain arrangements before he left with a firm of Jewish bankers whom he believed to be all-powerful in that city. The institution which had hitherto acted for the Government was the Ottoman Bank, and Javad, when he went to Paris, is believed to have had in his pocket a cut-and-dried arrangement with a group of Jewish bankers. He called on the representatives of the Ottoman Bank in Paris and treated them in a very cavalier way. His manners ought to have indicated to the Young Turkey Party that he was not the man to send to a European capital.

There were many stories of his conduct in that city which, if true, do not tell in his favour as a conciliatory statesman. One is that he went to see the Premier, who made the remark that he supposed that he had come with the object of obtaining a loan. Javad's reported answer was, "Nothing of the kind. I am here simply for pleasure." Three or four hours afterwards he called on the Minister of Finance and immediately began speaking of a loan, whereupon the Minister replied, "The Premier has just informed me that you are not here for a loan but simply for pleasure." Javad answered, "Oh, I was not going to tell him what my business was." Upon this the Minister pointed out that if he thought French Ministers did not trust each other he was making a great mistake. He soon found that the group with whom he had negotiated could not do the business, and he crossed over to England, thinking that with the powerful aid of Sir Ernest Cassel he could readily do it there. Sir Ernest had been invited to form a bank which would be entitled to call itself the National Bank of Turkey, and he had formed it. On the morning when the newspapers announced that Javad was crossing to England I met an Englishman of great authority on such questions who at once said, "Javad will

not receive a penny in England." Nor did he. Since then Javad has continued to be a prominent member of the Committee, but his influence is greatly diminished.

During 1910 and 1911 the Committee continued its work but made a series of grave blunders. In the spring of 1911 Hakki Pasha was Grand Vizier. He had been the representative of Turkey in Italy, and is a statesman who takes politics very coolly. In certain respects he reminded me of the late Mr. Henry Labouchere, especially in his power of considering questions as if he were an outsider. He speaks English well, and with the exception of the present Grand Vizier, Said Halim, is the only Turkish statesman who can do so. He had been the Turkish Commissioner at the Chicago Exhibition, and made a useful reputation there. He always gave me the impression, and I have known him fairly well for many years, that he cared little whether he was in office or not, but being in office would examine every question carefully and impartially. In the spring of 1911 Javad, the Minister of Finance, gave in his resignation to Hakki, which, after some hesitation, was accepted.

The extreme members of the Committee were still engaged upon their work of Turkifying everything, and this led them into many grave blunders, two of which had serious consequences. The Albanians were not allowed to receive instruction in their own language, but only in Turkish. Even in respect to the Arabs the proposal was made to forbid the teaching of that language. The struggle ended in permission being given to teach it, but the medium of instruction was to be Turkish. Now, as completely as Hebrew is the sacred language of the Jews, so is Arabic of Moslems. Nothing gave greater offence to the Moslem party than the giving of second place to Arabic in Moslem schools. The result was that there arose two serious questions, one with the Albanians and the other with the Arabs. The latter question soon became the more pressing. A project for the government of Yemen, which had been for years in a state of revolt, and where tens of thousands of

turkish soldiers had perished from the heat and malaria of the country, had been carefully prepared and finally approved by the Government, with the consent of the Arab deputies. Kiamil Pasha, when Grand Vizier, had taken great interest in it. His successor, Hilmi Pasha, had also examined it and approved. The Committee, however, now rejected it, always acting upon their determination to bring about a unification of language.

Another of their blunders during this time was to quarrel with the Greek subjects of the empire. A boycott of Greek ships, shops, and merchandise was preached, and with great success. The object, however, was not so much to injure the Greeks of the kingdom as the Greek subjects of Turkey. General discontent was also increasing in the army, produced by the unification idea. Troops were sent to fight Albanians who revolted at being forbidden to use their own language. A certain Colonel Sadyk was the organiser of discontent. Hakki, the Grand Vizier, took sides with those who wished to arrest Sadyk and put him on his trial for treason, but Shevket, who knew the temper of the troops better than Hakki, recognised that it would be dangerous to do so, the troops being unwilling to fire on their Moslem brethren in Albania, just as they were to fire on the dissatisfied Arabs. The struggle became so severe that Hakki threatened to take over the office of Minister of War himself, and to place Sadyk under a court-martial. Finally the matter was arranged by a compromise, and Sadyk was sent to Salonica.

When the Chamber of Deputies met in April, 1911, a struggle, kept more or less secret, went on between the supporters and the opponents of the Committee. It was soon evident that many of the members wished to get rid of Javad. In my opinion it was only due to the confidence that Hakki inspired by his coolness and judgment that a successful attempt at reaction was not then made. By the middle of May all Albania was ablaze. The Governor of Scutari had proclaimed a Holy War against the Albanians, but Moslem opinion forced him to back down two or three days afterwards. Then, on the suggestion of the Committee,

the Sultan went on a royal progress into Macedonia to meet the Albanians, and a remarkable religious service took place at which 80,000 Albanians were present on the Plain of Kossovo Pol, before the famous tomb of Murad I., who had been assassinated on the battlefield in 1389.

Of course in the midst of these troubles many foolish things were said on both sides, and when the Christians of Macedonia complained that the Committee's Government had already abandoned the principle of equality, a notable Moslem declared that such concession only applied to Moslems. Mr. Noel Buxton, the President of the Balkan Committee, which continued to do much useful work at this time, first by shewing its sympathy with the Young Turk movement, and secondly by fearlessly exposing its blunders, met the Committee at Salonica, and shewed them a great number of newspaper cuttings giving so many and detailed accounts of oppression to which Christians were subject as to make them declare that they were no better off than under Abdul Hamid, and finished by declaring that if they did not abandon this method of government they would lose all British sympathy.

Shortly afterwards Riza Tewfik, the Philosopher, told the Chamber of Deputies that he had been in England and other Western countries, and that their inhabitants knew more of what had passed in Macedonia than did the members of the Chamber themselves, and that the Turkification of the country was fast alienating Western friends. The greatest advantage that remained from the Revolution, and one which, but for unforeseen circumstances, might have worked the regeneration of Turkey, was that the right of free discussion continued unimpaired.

In giving an account of the events of 1911 in *The Contemporary Review*, I used the following words: "The fact remains that we (meaning Englishmen) had a unique opportunity of following our best national traditions and to some extent at least have lost it. A little friendly guidance without the slightest attempt at interference and an attitude of sympathy would have maintained or

trengthened our position." I quote them as part of a long article for the following reason. Having to visit Hakki Pasha on a matter of business, and with a colleague who only spoke French, after we had discussed it Hakki turned to me and, speaking in English, said, "I have read your article in *The Contemporary*." I asked how he had come to see it, and he informed me that Sir Gerard Lowther had lent it to him. Then, remembering how severely he had criticised the Committee for its many and serious blunders, I asked him candidly what he thought of it. His reply was, "I returned it to Sir Gerard Lowther with the remark, 'Sir Edwin criticises us very severely indeed, but they are the criticisms of a friend.' " My response was that I could not have wished that my article should have left a better impression than that. I believed that the Committee was on the right track, but that they were blundering and required a good deal of knocking into shape. He agreed, and I left.

The attempt at reaction of April 13, 1909, and the massacres in Cilicia marked a period of disorder in the country. The Committee was really struggling for its life. It was divided between a moderate and a nationalist section. An attempt was made at the organisation of the moderates in the Chamber, and Damat Ferid Pasha was at its head. The leader was a man of a refinement and culture quite exceptional among the Turks. I think I should be right in stating that of all the Turks I have met he is the most highly cultured. He may be taken as the typical Turkish gentleman. He had had experience in France, was well acquainted with the French language and literature, and has a fair knowledge also of English. The moderate and thoughtful element in the Turkish nation gathered round him, and under him there would have been formed a respected constitutional party which would have been in favour of progress, and would not have been open to the cry that they were enemies of Islam.

Suddenly the papers informed us that he would not continue to be the leader of the moderate party. The

general belief was that the Chauvinistic section of the Committee had intimated to the Sultan that it was not conformable to the dignity of a member of the imperial family that he should take an active part in politics. Much, no doubt, may be said in support of this proposition. But his ceasing to be the head of the party had a disastrous effect. It threw power into the hands of the Chauvinists. He himself was good enough to shew me a long extended programme that he proposed to issue, setting forth his opinions on what changes were necessary in the interest of Turkey and, always remembering that a leader has to be cautious in his statements, I do not hesitate to say that, from the Turkish point of view, it would have been difficult to improve upon.

Meantime many changes had been introduced by the Committee and much useful work was accomplished in the two years following 1909. I may note two or three. The destruction of the dogs of Constantinople required a bold hand. Visitors to the city, so long as the dogs existed, usually carried away a vivid impression of their numbers. Generally speaking, they appeared all to belong to the same breed. They were usually fox-coloured and foxy in appearance. They swarmed in all quarters of the city, but, of late years, especially where Europeans lived, the explanation being that there they were treated with more humanity than in the native quarters. When a bitch had pups, some kindly soul would put a box out in the street with a little straw and would bring daily food to the pups, who were really very pretty and interesting little beasts. I regret to say that they usually suffered cruel treatment from the Greeks. Neither Turks nor Armenians are cruel to animals, and I have often been interested at the kindness with which members of these races have treated them.

Having occasion one evening during an exceptionally cold winter to go into my kitchen, which was outside the house, I was surprised to find a donkey there belonging to my little daughter. The explanation given was that the stable was too cold. On the other hand, over and over again I have

seen street dogs kicked and struck by Greek boys, and few thought it well to protest. The dogs themselves were rarely savage, and were always amenable to kindness. I remember that from my own house a boy of six or seven went out every morning with his little arms full of morsels of bread. He would be immediately surrounded by twenty to thirty dogs, being all of that neighbourhood. He would distribute the bread among them, and if any animal shewed himself too eager to snatch a piece, he would hit it on the nose without any fear. I was often afraid on his account, not of the dogs or any of them attacking him or injuring him intentionally, but that in their eagerness to snatch the bread they might accidentally bite his fingers. This, however, never happened.

During those days the same boy became possessed of a fluffy Maltese Spaniel pup. Now, the rule amongst the dogs was that no animal not free of their quarter should pass through their territory without being attacked. He therefore took the pup in his arms, distributed his bread as usual, and the dogs came round, smelt the pup, and evidently made him free of the confraternity. From that time he was allowed to go into the streets and could roam amongst the dogs as he wished. On one occasion he passed the boundary line which by canine consent existed around their quarter. Immediately he was attacked by the dogs of the quarter beyond the line. He set up a cry of distress, and at once all the dogs in our quarter rushed to his aid, and he returned within his boundaries triumphantly.

While on the subject, let me tell another dog story. It has happened during two or three winters that cold weather has driven wolves down to Constantinople from the high lands of Thrace and the Rhodope. I saw one which had been shot a few hours previously near Ortakewi. A small pack of them arrived in the neighbourhood of San Stefano. In that village there were three dog quarters, and the villagers said that they were more given to quarrelling amongst themselves than usual. When the wolves appeared, however, they joined forces and drove away and dispersed

the pack, killing several of the beasts, and then returned to San Stefano to resume their quarrels.

I have said that I never knew them attack a man. I have passed alone many times through dozens of them, and although in some quarters they would bark at the presence of a stranger, or of a man not wearing the fez, I was never attacked nor have I ever heard a trustworthy account of anyone who was. If a dog rushed towards a man the mere pretext of picking up a stone would probably send him off howling. Nevertheless, the multiplicity of dogs was a nuisance. Mark Twain tells the story of seeing in Constantinople, in the most crowded street, a dog lying asleep right across the principal pavement, and hundreds of people going out of their way so as not to disturb him. In reality that was an ordinary daily sight. As to their being useful scavengers, that is simply rubbish. They caused infinitely more filth than they removed, and the city having already organised the means of collecting dust and rubbish, there was no pretence of their being of use.

Accordingly the decree went forth that they should be destroyed, and to our astonishment it was carried out strictly and effectively, but in a manner which to Europeans was peculiarly cruel. They were collected at night, placed in rubbish carts which were closed with iron lids, then put aboard a lighter from whence they could not escape, and shipped down to a waterless island about eight miles from the city, named Oxyaea. When the lighter arrived near the island the dogs gladly leaped into the water, in order to reach the land. There they were allowed to die of thirst. This process went on for three weeks or a month. Three or four of my friends went in their yachts or steam-launches to look at the animals on shore, and the stories they told were very gruesome. The new arrivals would be set upon by the others to drink their blood. However, they perished, and the story of the Constantinople dogs came to an end.

The Committee deserves credit also for changing the mode of reckoning time. The Turkish method was to call sunset twelve o'clock. In December this would be as early as

4.30 p.m. by European method; in June 7.40 p.m. No watch could ever keep correct time, and there was general relief when zenith time, i.e., twelve o'clock at noon, was substituted. The only persons who objected were a few old Moslems, who declared that they never knew when the hour for sunset prayer had arrived.

Let us turn to a more important subject. Three great fires in Stambul, during the three years following the Revolution of July, 1908, destroyed several thousands of houses. Constantinople has at all times been liable to great fires. It has no good building material. The small supply of good clay in the neighbourhood was used up centuries ago. The old Byzantine bricks, though better than any that are made now in or near the city, are thin, and when placed in a wall are between double the thickness of mortar or cement, the cement itself being harder than the brick. No building stone with lamination or split in it exists in the neighbourhood. It is true that marble is found in great quantity in the island which has given its name to the Sea of Marmara, but its working must always be too costly to bring it into general use. Hence through all its history wood has been the usual material for construction.

A terrible fire took place in Pera in 1871 or 1872, and when I arrived in the city a large district in it had been burnt down, the fire commencing at the Taxim and extending to and destroying the roof of the British Embassy. Thereupon orders were issued that no wooden buildings should be erected in Pera. The order was obeyed, with the result that that portion of the city has no more fires than a similar area would present in an English city. But in Stambul, largely on account of the poverty of the Turks, wooden buildings were renewed, and in one of the fires in question a conflagration commenced on the side of the Golden Horn not far from the landward wall, and burnt its way over a wide track right away to the Marmara, clearing away some hundreds of houses and leaving thousands of persons homeless.

The other two fires I have alluded to were almost equally

extensive and destructive. I have walked over the burnt districts many times and with many archæological friends, because we soon found that places which we had read of and had not been able to identify had now, in their stony strength, survived this and doubtless other conflagrations and gave us the information we wanted. The aspect of Stambul even now in many parts reminds me strikingly of Pompeii. The fierceness of the fire burnt up every particle of wood without leaving any black or charred remains whatever. Iron girders were twisted, and one sees the usual vagaries of great fires. A house would remain standing when everything around it had perished. I should think that at the present time at least one-fifth of Stambul is in ruins from the fires.

There is no reason to believe that either of the three fires was due to incendiaries, but they gave the city a chance which previous fires had no doubt often afforded to their predecessors. The Young Turks were more vigorous in their action. They saw that there was a chance of replanning the burnt quarters, and, above all, of laying down a system of drainage. Before I went to Constantinople I paid a visit to Sir Robert Rawlinson, a distinguished engineer who had many stories to tell of the time when he was sent by our Government during the Crimean war to improve the sanitary arrangements in the barracks near Constantinople. He told of his visiting the largest barracks, the Selimieh, and of finding the stench so horrible that he was not surprised at the terrible rate of mortality amongst our troops who were there in hospital. He began by giving orders to break open every window, and then smashed the drains which led from the barracks into the Bosphorus. The local doctors protested, but he had full power, and within a fortnight had greatly reduced the rate of mortality. He told me that he would like to be sent to Constantinople again in order to draw up a plan for the drainage of the city, "For," said he, "no place I was ever in lent itself so easily to perfect drainage, and no place is so badly drained." The Young Turks, to their credit be it said, called in the best engineers they could find, and drew up a general plan of drainage for

Stambul and laid down drains in the streets which they had planned for the burnt quarters.

While on the subject of fires, I may mention an interesting piece of work with which I was charged by Sir Nicholas O'Connor. Constantinople being so liable to fires, it was natural that there should be a great many fire insurance companies. Twenty of these were British. Some excellent French companies also existed, as well as Swiss, German, and Austrian. The respectable companies of various nationalities formed what they called a Fire Committee to defend the interests of their companies. I was the legal adviser of this group. Many disputes had arisen with the Government, and absurd decisions had been given in the law courts, due partly to sheer ignorance of law, and partly also to the desire, not uncommon amongst ignorant men, to throw the burden of a loss by fire upon a wealthy company without regard either to the provisions of the policy or to common sense and justice.

Sometimes difficulties arose from the defects of Turkish law itself. For example, in the case of life insurance, where the heir of a person insured claimed a sum considerably larger than he was entitled to, the company offered a reasonable amount, which was refused. The president of the court, an exceptionally able and kindly judge, mentioned privately to the English Dragoman, who always formed an essential part of the court in "mixed cases"—that is, in cases between Ottoman and foreign subjects—that he was convinced that life insurance was contrary to Islamic law, and that in private conversation with a Moslem of eminence the latter expressed himself very strongly on the subject. The Dragoman and I discussed the matter, and having arrived at the conclusion that such a decision would create great confusion in all the Life offices in the city, it was agreed that I should see the advocate on the other side and endeavour to arrange the matter out of court. This was done.

To this hour, however, the question as to whether life insurance is lawful or not has never been settled in a Turkish court. The position taken up is very much that which was

submitted two centuries ago in England, namely, that each insurance is a bet and of the nature of gambling. The contention is true, but of course other considerations have to be examined in order to shew that it is in the interest of the public that such operations, whether bets or not, should be regarded as lawful.

It was, however, in reference to fire insurances that we had the most trouble with the Government. Under the Vizierat of Ferid Pasha a commission was named to draw up a new law on the subject. After some months the law appeared and was at once passed over to me for examination. I found it a mass of blunders from beginning to end, blunders so gross that every respectable fire insurance company then working in Turkey would have closed its office rather than consent to work under it. I am depending upon my memory and therefore cannot quote many of the absurdities in the law. One, however, was that if, during a fire, neighbouring buildings were pulled down by the police or ordinary firemen to prevent its spreading, the company should support the damage caused to such neighbouring buildings whether they were insured or not. Another was that the amount mentioned in the policy of assurance was the amount that the company would have to pay without any provision for the case when goods had been removed or that the goods or house did not possess such a value. I subsequently learnt that it had been drawn up by two of the legal advisers of the Porte, carefully, though somewhat stringently, as regards the insurance offices, but that it had been sent to various heads of departments who had added whatever clause they liked without regard to the assurers.

Sir Nicholas O'Connor sent the draft of the new law down to me to examine on behalf of British companies. I informed the secretary who brought it that it ought never to be accepted by the British Embassy, and expressed myself so strongly on the matter that he requested that I would see Sir Nicholas rather than that he should take the message. I accordingly drove up to the Embassy, when Sir

Nicholas informed me that he had promised the Grand Vizier that he would give him an answer the following day, whether the British Embassy would accept it or desired modifications. I argued that it was simply impossible to accept it; that it was a blow struck at every foreign insurance company doing business in the country. Sir Nicholas replied that he had promised to return it with the articles objected to, and begged that I would go through it with one of his secretaries and mark out the articles to which I objected. My reply was that I was ready to do so, but I gave fair notice that at least two-thirds of the articles must come out. He said that was my business, and accordingly I struck them out.

Once more, however, in the absence of Sir Nicholas, the attempt was made to get practically the same law adopted, and through a mistake I was not informed of the matter until the *Chargé d'Affaires* had sent the project on to the Foreign Office with a general approval. As soon as I heard of the fact I immediately went to see him and explained the position. It was the present Sir George Barclay. After careful discussion, he suggested that I should write a memorandum on the matter, which he would at once transmit to the Board of Trade. This I did, and there, where the matter came within the knowledge of people who knew something of Insurance Law, orders were at once sent disapproving of the project altogether.

The Committee and Government turned their attention to decentralisation. The task was an extremely difficult one, because they recognised that if the Governor of a province were allowed to make what regulations he liked for the province, one of his first thoughts would be how to fill his own pockets. It had been so and was so. On the other hand, with the object of getting everything under the control of the Sultan and of his Ministers, and also of preventing local abuses, laws had been passed which so crippled the local Governors and their Councils that nothing could be done for the good of the province. People indeed who had vested interests would go to town and, by means of carefully

distributed bribes, would block any system of local roads or other improvements until their opponents offered a heavier bribe. This abuse also was taken in hand very seriously by the Committee.

The usual case in the provinces was that the Governor was occupied in feathering his own nest, and, in general, no one dared to interfere. Under such conditions, no roads or bridges were repaired, nothing was done in the way of improvement, and the condition of the province went from bad to worse. After the Revolution several improvements in these respects followed. Better Governors had been named, and most of them recognised that they were on their good behaviour. The danger from the action of the Committee arose from their trying to do everything themselves, to keep even the arrangements of detail in their own hands. Abdul Hamid had tried the same system and had failed.

The new Governors, many of them full of enthusiasm for improvement, prepared plans for gendarmerie, for the repair of roads and bridges, the construction of railways, drainage of marshes, and a hundred other improvements. Many such projects were sent to Constantinople for examination and approval, but there soon came from the provinces notes of a widespread feeling that there was as much difficulty in getting local improvements accomplished as under the old régime. Hence the recognition that decentralisation was necessary. Give full power, it was said, to the Governor and his local Council, and hold him responsible if he sanctions anything in the province which is opposed to the general interest of the empire. Arrangements were being carefully studied with the object of settling the relations between the Central Government and the local Governors and Council, when the counter Revolution came.

Perhaps the most important progress made during the two years after the Revolution was in the development of gendarmerie. If the intervention of the Powers had produced no other result than the introduction of such a system, it would have rendered valuable assistance to the country. Even before the Revolution the system had begun

to work so well that, by common consent after that event, it was extended to other parts of the empire. Schools for the training of gendarmes were established at Smyrna and Beyrout, upon the model of that which had been opened in Salonica. The best-governed districts in Macedonia, I am proud to say, were those under British officers. But throughout the country after the Revolution the men were taught under European officers, and commanded respect from all sections of the population. They took the place of the zaptiehs, and in various places there was considerable rivalry between the old and new forces. Before the two years had passed, the population in general had given a hearty support to the gendarmes such as they had never given to the zaptiehs. They really assisted the authorities to keep order. The men received a slightly higher pay than the soldiers from whom they were selected, and thus the service got the best men. Under the old system the zaptiehs were the riff-raff of the army.

A new spirit seemed to have come into the employés of the Turkish Government, one which struck the attention especially of old residents in the country. The gendarmes seemed to feel that they existed for the convenience of the public. I remember in June, 1910, a pleasant incident that occurred to me in a remote and purely Turkish quarter of Stambul. The genial Professor Knight of Aberdeen was my companion on a visit to some of the least-known sites in the city, and was as enthusiastic an archæologist as he had been thirty years earlier. But he suddenly broke down from fatigue. I hastened to find him a seat, when a gendarme came up, fetched water, rendered other services, and was as courteous to our party of five as the best of London policemen could have been. Almost everybody had a similar story to tell of willing service rendered.

Real reforms were accomplished also in the Customs House by the Committee. The Government wanted an increase of customs duties of three per cent. during the time of Sir Nicholas O'Connor. Sir Nicholas refused to advise the Government to consent until he had seen a serious attempt

at reorganising the Custom House service. Happily they secured the service of Mr. (now Sir) Richard Crawford, who had successfully reorganised the like service in Egypt. The Committee obtained its three per cent.

Perhaps the most notable advance to be signalised during the years in question was the movement for the education of Turkish women. It was largely spontaneous, and though regarded with sympathy by all well-wishers to Turkey, owes little of its force to direct foreign influence. When "hurriet" was proclaimed for men, a few extremists among the women wished to shew that they also were now emancipated. Some went as far as to discard the yashmak, or face-covering. But the thoughtful recognised that conventionalities must be respected if useful reforms were to be pressed forward. The Turkish idea is that to uncover the face in presence of men is immodest. The few women who violated this sentiment were regarded and treated as English women would be if they walked down Regent Street in very low-necked dresses. The reforms sought by Turkish women were of a sensible and practical character. They recognised that their great want was education. Classes on a variety of subjects were formed by the women themselves. I received much information from my lady friends of these meetings. The social conditions under which Turkish women live cause them to have abundant time on their hands. There is an enforced inactivity which develops among the thoughtless a pernicious idleness.

Readers of Pierre Loti's book, *Les Désenchantées*, will find a vivid description of Turkish women. As a fact, however, the women described were only half Turkish. I discussed the book with my friend, Hamdi Bey, and share his opinion that as a picture of Turkish women's life it is essentially false. Some of the best Turkish women in Constantinople have received instruction in American or English schools, and have exerted great influence for good amongst their fellow-women in the capital who are ignorant of any foreign language.

In the beginning of 1909 Miss Isabel Fry went to Turkey

to see whether she could render any assistance to the movement for women's education. She met a considerable number of the leaders, and I am assured from many sources, especially by ladies who knew what was the result of her work, that her influence was extremely valuable. I mentioned in 1910 an instance of the useful work which the stimulus of her presence had produced. A weekly class was then being held at the great American College for Girls at Scutari of about eighty Turkish women, who were studying preventive medicine, the sanitary arrangements of the household, the management of children, and similar subjects of primary importance to the sex. The lecturers were medical men, for the *hakim* or doctor is privileged, and Turkish women may attend his lecture while conventionality would prevent their being present at lectures by other men. Turkey had travelled over a very difficult road before Turkish women could meet for the consideration of such subjects and willingly receive information in the form of lectures. I concluded an article on "Developments in Turkey" in *The Contemporary Review* of June, 1910, with the remark that the Government, though it deserved criticism, had succeeded in improving the condition of the country, and was "the best Government which Turkey has ever had. Its faults are those of inexperience, which time will cure."

CHAPTER XXI

ANNEXATION OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Prince Ferdinand declares himself King—Reorganisation of the Turkish Navy—Difficulties with Albania—The Balkan League—Its Successes—Dissensions—Mediation of the Powers—Orthodox and Bulgarian Churches Agree for Common Action—My Last Interview with Marschall von Bieberstein—*Coup d'état*—Assassination of Nazim Pasha—Forced Resignation of Kiamil—Arrival of Sir Louis Mallet—Quarrel between Bulgaria and Serbia—Assassination of Shevket Pasha—British Relief Committees in Constantinople.

AFTER the Revolution of July, 1908, Austria, who was always on the lookout for carrying into execution her project of getting to the Aegean, boldly proclaimed her annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. I have mentioned in previous pages that when Russia in April, 1877, declared war upon Turkey, she had already made a secret agreement with Austria, by which she was to take over the administration of these provinces. In doing so she had become *de facto* ruler over them. She now declared that they were Austrian territory.

As the conduct of Austria with reference to Turkey was throughout the years that had elapsed from 1877 to 1908 one long attempt to keep Macedonia in disorder and to make Serbia a subservient Austrian province, it is only fair that I should recognise that in the administration of the annexed provinces, especially during the time of a certain Baron Kaula, she had governed them well. The Moslem population had stoutly resisted, but had been fought and defeated, and the good administration that ensued converted them into loyal Austrian subjects. As those who have travelled much

in Austria know, its local Government is grandmotherly, but it secures order, a fair amount of justice, and religious liberty. Beyond doubt it was an excellent substitute for Turkish government.

When Austria's declaration was known, it created much ill feeling in Turkey. A few took up the position, for which there was much to be said, that the change was merely nominal, that the provinces declared to be Austrian had long been governed by that country, and that the question whether they were called Austrian or Turkish mattered little. I remember seeing in Vienna a regiment from the annexed provinces, the men wearing the fez to indicate that they still belonged to Turkey. But those who had spoken with them declared that they were well satisfied with their new masters.

Following the example of the Emperor of Austria, Ferdinand of Bulgaria, hitherto styled Prince, and acknowledging fealty somewhat ostentatiously to the Sultan, paid a hasty visit to Vienna and almost contemporaneously with the decree annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina declared himself King. This again increased the agitation amongst the Turks, but they soon had other and more important matters to occupy their attention.

In the autumn of 1911 Italy sent an ultimatum to Turkey declaring her intention of occupying Tripoli, and on October 26 in that year notified to the Powers her annexation of that Turkish province. She sent an army, first of 40,000 and then of 100,000, across the Mediterranean. As to the war itself, little need be said here. The Italians at the first were far from successful. Indeed, the impression they left upon me was one of incompetence, and when in the spring of 1915 there was a question of their going to war with Austria, I made a remark to this effect to an Italian soldier whom I knew with sufficient intimacy to speak with confidentially. I was glad to be assured by him that while I was right in my estimate of the conduct of the Tripolitaine war, it had served as the most useful lesson to the Italians that they had ever received. The Treaty of Ouchy which brought the war

suddenly to an end was followed by a series of army reforms, especially among the Engineers and Gunners, which entirely remodelled the army. Tripoli was acknowledged by Turkey to belong to Italy, and thus the whole series of provinces from the Red Sea to the Atlantic which had once acknowledged the sway of the Sultan of Turkey had passed into foreign hands. While it is true that the Italians had not shone as victors, they certainly did better than the Turks, though of course the command of the sea by the Italians gave them an enormous advantage.

The Turks meantime had been so much occupied with the internal dissensions arising out of the efforts of Young Turkey, that they had largely neglected their army organisation. Beyond pouring into Tripoli as many men as they could get there, the Turks properly so-called made a poor show. They had, however, in the capital taken on a few more German officers. As the Italians commanded the sea the Turks now recognised that they had continued the blunder of Abdul Hamid in neglecting the fleet. They thereupon naturally determined to strengthen it. For this purpose they applied to England, which sent them a naval officer, Admiral Gamble, who was given a high command. He worked assiduously, and not only from his own mouth, but from the officers and men under him I learnt that he was making most important changes. But his difficulties were enormous. Officers and men were alike untrained, and with lax discipline. Ships were sent to sea without provisions, and Admiral Gamble was attempting to undo in months the neglect of many years. His health broke down, and he was succeeded by Admiral Williams, also belonging to our navy. He also did much to improve the condition of the Turkish fleet, though in a more quiet and unobtrusive way than Gamble.

Both these Admirals, whom I knew well, had their hearts in their work. They spoke with enthusiasm of the Turkish sailor, whom they found obedient, willing to do whatever he was asked, and, I may add, absolutely devoted to his British chiefs. When Admiral Williams left, during the year 1912,

he was succeeded by Admiral Limpus, who brought with him a few officers and set about a systematic reconstruction of Admiralty organisation. That the Turkish fleet has been able, during the last year, to make a respectable show is due to the efforts of these three Englishmen, and to none more completely than to Admiral Limpus. The last time I saw him was in December, 1914, in Malta, where I was able to discuss with him and his wife the destruction of the *Messudieh*, the daring feat which had been accomplished by a submarine which had penetrated the Dardanelles as far as Nagara Point, and after lying at the bottom for eight hours had sunk her, the *Messudieh* being specially interesting to the family of the Admiral as having been his flagship.

Serious efforts were made by Hadji Adil Bey to reconcile the Albanians to Turkish rule. They failed because the extreme section of the Committee would have none of his reforms. They would make the Albanians loyal subjects, whether Moslems or Christians, by Turkifying everything and as far as possible preventing the use of their ancient language. But their neighbours sympathised with them, and the Albanian insurgents were joined by a portion of the army. At Monastir a "Military League" was formed, the object of which was to suppress the Committee. The proceedings indeed bore a pretty close resemblance to those which had led up to the Revolution of July, 1908. Then four years afterwards, in July, 1912, the two most important members of the Ministry, Kutchuk Saïd the Grand Vizier, and Shevket Pasha, Minister of War, resigned.

It looked to us as if Turkey was relapsing even into a worse anarchy than that from which the Albanian army had saved her four years earlier. Thereupon the Sultan sent for Ghazi Mukhtar Pasha, who formed a Ministry largely composed of experienced men, and for a while hopes of a more stable Government were awakened. These hopes were in part realised, but the dangers to the Young Turkey Party were steadily increasing. Two massacres occurred which alarmed the Ministry and hastened the action of the Balkanic League. One was of Bulgarians at Kotchana, the

other of Serbs near the Montenegrin frontier. The Italian war had dragged on with great weariness, the Turks, or rather the Arabs, becoming gradually weaker. At length peace was hastily patched up because the Porte had become aware that the armies of the Balkanic League had already commenced mobilisation.

Serbia and Bulgaria had suffered largely from the disorders in Macedonia, Bulgaria even worse than Serbia. Serbia desired an outlet to the Adriatic, and accordingly an agreement was signed between these two states by which they bound themselves to each other to divide Macedonia and to support each other against Turkey. The Treaty was dated on February 29, old style, March 13. It provided that the northern part of Macedonia should be taken by Serbia, and the southern portion, including Ochrida and Monastir, by Bulgaria, the boundary line running in a north-easterly direction from Ochrida to Golem. Between Serbian and Bulgarian territory there was a district which is conveniently spoken of as the "contested zone." A secret annexe to the Treaty provided that if the contracting parties could not agree as to the division of the contested zone, the decision should be submitted to the arbitration of the Czar of Russia, who consented to act in that capacity. Shortly afterwards Greece claimed to join Bulgaria and Serbia, and her claim was admitted.

Without attempting to trace the war in detail, the important facts are the following : Montenegro declared war on Turkey on October 8, 1912 ; the armies of Serbia and Bulgaria were already being mobilised. Thereupon, on October 15, Italy and Turkey concluded peace. Three days later Serbia declared war "to secure the liberty and welfare of Macedonia." On October 22 her troops captured Prishtina from the Turks. Six days later, October 28, the Turks were defeated at Kumanova by the Serbians. After forty-eight hours of hard fighting, Uskub, the ancient capital of Serbia, fell to them, and another detachment reached the Adriatic at Durazzo and Alessio.

Meantime the Bulgarians met with even greater success in

Thrace. The famous struggles at Kirk Kilissé and the neighbourhood on October 22 and 23 were a surprise to Europe. The Bulgarians completely routed and drove the Turks before them until they reached the Lines of Chatalja, a series of fortifications about twenty-five miles from Constantinople and extending from the Marmara to the Black Sea. There the Turks made a brave stand. It is now known that the Turkish officer commanding sent to Constantinople to state that he could not hold out against another tremendous attack such as the Bulgars had made. Meantime Russia had intervened and had informed Bulgaria that she did not wish the Bulgarians to press on to Constantinople. It is difficult to conjecture what was Russia's idea in making this communication to Bulgaria.

It is easy to be wise after the event, but one can recognise now that if, at the great check which Turkey received at Chatalja, Bulgarian statesmen had insisted upon terms of peace being there and then signed, the Balkan war might have terminated. The intervention of Russia probably prevented such an event. We in Constantinople watched the progress of the struggle from day to day. We saw thousands of wounded being brought into San Stefano, an absolute breakdown in Turkish military and sanitary organisation, and the general belief was that the Bulgarians would soon enter the city triumphantly.

Unhappily grave dissensions had arisen among the Balkan States. When Austria let it be known that she was opposed to permitting Serbia to have access to the Adriatic she turned for compensation towards obtaining a larger share of Macedonia. It is asserted that a secret arrangement was made between the representatives of Greece and those of Serbia by which Bulgaria was to be excluded altogether from the portion of that province which had been assigned to her by the Treaty of March 13, 1912, while even the disputed section which was to have been left to the decision of the Czar was secretly divided between Serbia and Greece. I am writing without access to the full notes which I made on the subject, and therefore cannot be certain about

my dates, but if such a treaty were made it was a gross act of treachery on the part of Serbia and Greece towards their ally.

One of the first incidents which gave rise to the conviction that difficulties had arisen between the Allies was a race between the Greeks and Bulgarians for the occupation of Salonica. The Greeks arrived a few hours before the Bulgarians, and it looked as if there were a possibility there and then of an armed conflict between the two armies for the possession of that city. The Turkish army had made what everyone regarded as a mere show of resistance; in other words had allowed the Greeks to take possession of the city, the suggestion even being made that this was done by arrangement with the Turkish Governor. This took place on November 8, 1912. The Greeks at once installed a Greek Government, but on the arrival of the Bulgarian army a joint occupation was arranged between them and the Greeks, the administration, however, being allowed to remain in Greek hands.

On November 4 Turkey appealed to the Powers for their mediation. The last attack on Chatalja was, I think, on November 17. On December 3 all the belligerents except Greece agreed upon an armistice, and a Conference met in London on December 16.

Let me mention to the credit of the Orthodox Church that its leaders in Constantinople behaved with dignity and good sense when it appeared certain that the Bulgarians would enter. They probably shared the intense hostility which has raged for centuries between Greeks and Slavs, a hostility which had been largely increased by the struggle between the followers of the Orthodox Patriarch and the adherents of the Bulgarian Exarch. In view of the almost immediate occupation of the city by a Bulgarian army they forgot their differences in what they regarded as the triumph of the Christian cause. They were mainly anxious to learn how they, as the leaders of the Orthodox Church in Turkey, should meet the captors. I saw some of the leaders and was delighted with their reasonableness. I reminded them that they had declared the Bulgarian Church to be in schism,

and they at once answered that they had thought of that and had no doubt that that difficulty could be overcome in a few hours. Then I was afraid as to the difficulties between the Patriarch and the Exarch. I suggested that, in accordance with ecclesiastical usage, the Metropolitan in his own city always stood first. Did I believe that the Exarch would resist such a claim? Speaking as a lawyer and looking into the question with detachment, I expressed my confidence that he would do nothing of the kind. Many other questions were discussed which are not relevant to my purpose, which is only to shew that Greeks and Bulgarians, though bitterly opposed to each other on traditional and racial grounds, can examine questions with fairness the instant something more is involved than the mere dominancy of one section of Christians over another.

I have already mentioned that the Sultan had wisely sent for Ghazi Mukhtar Pasha, and that the Ministry formed under him included experienced men as well as Young Turks. I was in England at the time, and on the day when the news came I paid a call at the Ritz Hotel on Baron Marschall von Bieberstein. As it was the last time I saw him I may be excused for speaking of it. I sent up my card, and after two minutes saw a stately lady coming downstairs with her back towards the light, and heard a voice, "Is it me you wish to see, Sir Edwin, or my husband?" I at once recognised the Baroness. During two years I had gladly given advice to a committee of an International Home for young women of which the Baroness was President, and had assisted in the purchase of a house for the committee which was in the name of my son as trustee for the Home. Like all persons interested in the work, I was favourably impressed with her business-like capacity, sincere interest in the work and devotion to it. In reply to her question I responded, "This time it is the Baron I wish to see." After some little conversation I found the footman who had taken up my card with a message that Baron Marschall would see me at once. He received me with more than his usual cordiality. Two remarks that he made in the course of a conversation

remain quite clear in my memory. "Of course you have seen the telegrams in the morning papers as to the new Ministry." I had. What did I think of it? "It promises to be stable and to put an end to internal dissensions." "Yes," said the Baron, "in my opinion it is the best that I have ever seen in Turkey."

The second observation was that it was delightful to him to be in England. He was in a new moral atmosphere, and had been charmed with the high level of intellect which he had encountered. The two men, apparently, with whom he had been most impressed for what he called their transcendent ability were Lord Kitchener and Lord Morley. He spoke of others, and as appeared to me then it appears to me now, with a just estimate of their characteristics. What impressed him most favourably was the fine moral atmosphere of our statesmen. He then used words virtually to the following effect: "I have long wanted to be Ambassador to England, because, as you know, for years I have considered it a misfortune to the world that our two countries are not really in harmony. I consider that I am here as a man with a mission, my mission being to bring about a real understanding between the two nations." In saying my last word about the Baron I unhesitatingly add that I believe he was sincere in what he said. Of that I have no doubt. He was a man of strong will, and, unless general report was mistaken, he had been sent to Constantinople by the Kaiser because he could not agree with his sovereign in his way of regarding political questions.

Shortly afterwards, and on the eve of my leaving England, I delivered an address on the situation to the Eastern Questions Association, and had the pleasure afterwards of meeting at dinner Mr. Takè Jonescu, the leader of the Rumanian Liberal Party, Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, whom I had known as correspondent of the *Times* in Constantinople during the Ambassadorship of Lord Dufferin, with whom Sir Donald went to India, and other experts on Eastern questions.

The new Ministry found its greatest difficulty in Macedonia. In an article in *The Contemporary Review* of November, 1912, and it was probably posted not later than October 10, I remarked that "at the moment of closing this article the outbreak of war seems almost inevitable," Macedonia being then, and always for years past, the great subject of contention. The new Ministry which had been formed included both Young Turks and some of the best men who had served under Abdul Hamid. In the same article I remarked that it was hard on the Ministry to have to repair the blunders of its predecessors.

As I have already mentioned, the great struggle with the Balkan League commenced at the end of October or the beginning of November. In January, 1913, the Young Turkey extremists were making frantic efforts to gain power, the leader of these efforts being Enver Bey. An ugly *coup d'état* was made on January 23, 1913, when Nazim Pasha was assassinated. At the same time Kiamil Pasha was forced by Enver to sign his resignation, and the veteran ceased once more to be Grand Vizier.

The great Powers had advised that the demand of the Balkan League for the cession of Adrianople should be accepted, and for a time everybody believed that a definite boundary between Turkey and Bulgaria was agreed to by both sides as existing in a line to be drawn from Enos to Media. Kiamil Pasha was disposed to yield to the invitation of the Powers. The Committee considered that this was a favourable moment to drive him from office on the ground that the nation should never consent to any sacrifice of territory. A military deputation headed by Enver entered the room where the Turkish Cabinet were planning a reply to the invitation of the Powers and declared that the army would never consent to abandon Adrianople. It was in presence of their insistence that Kiamil wrote out his resignation and gave it to Enver, who at once hastened to the palace to present it to the Sultan. Nazim was shot in endeavouring to prevent Enver from getting into the Council Chamber.

The new Ministry seemed as ready as the old to make

peace with the Balkan States, and on March 2 asked for the mediation of the Powers. On March 28, 30,000 Turks submitted at Adrianople with Ghazi Mukhtar Pasha at their head, and the city was surrendered. The Turks in Yanina had already, on March 6, surrendered that city to the Greeks. On April 21 the Balkanic States accepted the mediation of the Powers unconditionally with certain slight reservations. The Enos Media line was, however, definitely accepted. All claim to the Island of Crete was abandoned. The question of the Aegean Islands, some of which were in the occupation of the Greeks and others of Italy, was agreed to be settled by the Powers.

The whole episode of the murder of Nazim and the forcing of Kiamil to resign was a disagreeable one, and in the absence of further explanation must be set down to the discredit of Enver. Shevket Pasha became Minister of War and Grand Vizier. The delegates of Turkey and of the Balkan States were in London, but were making very slow progress. On January 26 the Balkan delegates in London decided to break off further negotiations with the Porte. I happened to be in London in the month of February, and lunched with Mr. Scoloudi, one of the Greek delegates who had remained behind. He was a link with the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78. At that time he resided in Constantinople, and the late Duke of Devonshire, then Marquess of Hartington, had a two hours' interview with him, of which he remarked to a friend of mine that he had learnt more of the Balkan questions from him than from anyone else. I was delighted therefore to hear from Mr. Scoloudi, in February, 1913, that he considered that the difficulties between Turkey and all the Balkan States would be satisfactorily arranged. Unfortunately, in this opinion he erred. The Turks considered themselves free to continue the war with Bulgaria. On March 25, however, the latter succeeded in obtaining possession of Adrianople. On May 13 the Balkan States agreed to cease fighting and to send delegates to London for a conference. The Powers on the following day occupied Scutari.

When on June 17, 1913, Sir Louis Mallet, who had been Assistant Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, was appointed Ambassador at Constantinople, the situation had become terribly complicated, for on June 11 Mahmud Shevket Pasha, Grand Vizier and Minister of War, was assassinated. A few days afterwards Said Halim was appointed Grand Vizier. On June 30 the second Balkanic war commenced. I can only give impressions with regard to it, because all the necessary facts for arriving at a decision are not yet known to me. The Premier of Bulgaria at the time was my friend, M. Gueschoff, whom I have known for thirty years as a man of good judgment, clear insight, and incapable of dishonourable action. He had met Mr. Passitch, the Premier of Serbia, in order to discuss and arrange terms of peace. The discussion progressed and appeared on the point of conclusion, when the military delegate suddenly introduced new conditions which Gueschoff immediately recognised as certain to lead to war between Bulgaria and Serbia. Gueschoff would have nothing to say to them and shortly afterwards resigned. The military representative persisted in his demands, with the result which Gueschoff had foreseen. Serbia and Greece had apparently prepared themselves for war against Bulgaria. To the dismay of all well-wishers to the Balkan States, it broke out with exceptional fury. Bulgaria was badly beaten, withdrew her troops from Adrianople, which after a long siege she had captured, and then Rumania struck in. Bulgaria was quite unable to resist the States thus allied against her, and signed the Treaty of Bucharest in August, 1913, the Rumanian army being then only about fifteen miles from Sofia.

The story is one of the most miserable in modern history. The future historian will be able to say who were mainly to blame for it. Popular opinion rightly or wrongly points to King Ferdinand as the instigator of the second war, but Bulgarians affirm that Serbia and Greece had come to the secret arrangement already mentioned which violated the original treaty, and made a conflict inevitable. The contested zone was not left to the division of the Czar

but was divided between Serbia and Greece to the entire exclusion of Bulgaria. This of itself was an act of gross injustice. The defence of Serbia against a charge of acting unfairly would probably be the following: Part of the original understanding was that Serbia should obtain a road to the Adriatic, but at an early stage in the war Austria stepped in and declared that she would not permit this. The desire to have such a road was a natural and legitimate one on the part of Serbia. Austria blocked it as part of her policy of keeping her road clear down to Salonica. When, however, Serbia's desire to get to the Adriatic was thus blocked, she claimed that circumstances had so changed that she was not under any obligation to respect the stipulations in the Treaty of March 13, 1912.

The result of the war was that Bulgaria lost a strip of territory taken possession of by Rumania, which contains the important town of Silistria and a population of about a quarter of a million of Bulgarians; that she lost further the port of Cavalla on the Aegean and received only the miserable open roadstead of Dédeagatch; that the southern portion of Macedonia, which it had been definitely agreed should belong to Bulgaria, was taken possession of by Greece, and the contested area was not left to the decision of the Czar, but was divided between the enemies of Bulgaria. It is easy to point out blunders and follies committed by the Bulgarians, but they are no justification for the injustice committed by Serbia and Greece. The historian and statesman looking into the future recognises that the two Slav states will as inevitably come together as English statesmen on the accession of James I. of England and VI. of Scotland must have recognised that the two kingdoms would be united. Bulgaria and Serbia, with Rumania on the east and Greece on the south-west, will ultimately form a Balkanic League which will be the barrier of civilisation in the south of Europe, provided that they can arrange to drop their local and racial differences and act loyally together.

Before passing on to the events of 1914 something must

we said of the committees formed for the relief of Christian and Moslem victims during the Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913. The distress in the army, and especially in the civil population of Thrace, was terrible. Trains full of wounded men were sent back to Constantinople. The sanitary and medical arrangements of the Turks were hopelessly bad. Mr. Ashmead Bartlett in one of his graphic letters said that "the Turks unaided were incapable of organising a village circus." We heard of the hideous condition of hundreds of wounded soldiers who had come into San Stefano, about twelve miles from the city. A Swiss lady, who, I believe had come out as nurse under one of the excellent philanthropic arrangements due to the action and influence of Lady Dufferin, was in San Stefano and was the only person devoting herself, as she was doing night and day, to the service of the wounded.

The Rev. Mr. Frew went down to see for himself. I saw him on the evening of his visit, and his account more than confirmed the worst stories of neglect and incompetence which were current. We learned from others that men who had died in the train were simply thrown out of the railway carriages. Those who arrived were lying about the streets uncared for, some alive, some dying or dead. The floor of a schoolroom into which Mr. Frew made his way with great difficulty, and against the wish of the officer in command, was covered with dead and dying. Bread was thrown in amongst them and scrambled for by those who still had life enough to make the effort. With splendid energy Mr. Frew set himself the task of producing order. I saw him next evening in command of two large motor-cars belonging, I believe, to Mr. Hoffmann Phillips, Secretary of the American Embassy. These were filled with loaves, medicaments, and provisions of various kinds for the sick and wounded. It was Saturday night, but he had arranged for others to take his service at the Presbyterian Church, whilst he, with Mr. Phillips and another, went off to San Stefano and remained there fully a week, all working like Trojans. Their efforts drove the Government, for very shame, to do something for their own men.

Meantime women, children, and old men were pouring into the city and were in the direst distress. A committee was formed of which Lady Lowther was the president. Virtually every member of the British community was upon it, and the ladies under her direction organised relief in a very efficient manner. Funds were sent from England and America, which countries always supply more money for benevolent purposes in Turkey than any other States or than all other States put together. Local ladies' committees were formed, which visited the camps of refugees and distributed relief. In addition to the great organisation under Lady Lowther, whose labours were incessant and intelligent, Miss Burgess, the head of the Quaker Mission, with the assistance of Mr. Hobhouse and others, were actively engaged in these works of mercy. The organisation of these committees was such that they did not clash. I saw a good deal of what was done by one ladies' committee, of which Lady Block was President and my daughter an active member. My wife and other ladies who were unable to take an active part in distributing relief were constantly occupied in making bandages and garments for the refugees. The energy and goodwill which was shewn by all was wonderful and was largely aided by the personal activity and charm of Lady Lowther.

It was felt by some of the Moslems in England and India that it was their duty to assist the distressed Moslem women and children. They may have thought that in the efforts made by so many Christians to relieve members of their own faith, Moslems would be neglected. As a simple matter of fact, they were not, for relief was granted without distinction of race or creed. But all means of relief were welcomed. When, therefore, a Committee was formed in England under the presidency of the Rt. Hon. Ameer Ali for the special relief of the Moslem sufferers in the war, its aid was gladly accepted. Colonel Surtees was sent by Ameer Ali's Committee to form one in Constantinople to give relief. Three Englishmen and three Turks formed the local committee. The three Turks were Ferid Pasha, the ex-Grand

vizier, Damat Ferid Pasha, whom I have already referred to as a Turk of the best class, and the brother of the actual Sherif of Mecca, whose name I forget. The three Englishmen selected were Colonel Surtees, myself, and Colonel Minicombe Pasha, the latter an old and a well-trusted Resident in Constantinople. At a later period, when Colonel Surtees had to return to England, Mr. Frew was elected in his place.

Our meetings went on regularly and steadily during several months at Damat Ferid Pasha's house. Mr. Frew once more shewed his energy. We organised relief in the form of hot rations and distributed them daily to between four and five thousand Turkish women and children. For this purpose we had been granted the use of a mosque yard in the heart of Stambul. It was an interesting and sometimes a heartrending sight to see the women and children, many of whom had been reduced to skin and bone for want of food. But the sight confirmed me in the opinion I have often expressed, that there is no race in Europe so amenable to discipline and so easy to govern as the Turks. We had discovered two or three old soldiers who, without fuss or noise, arranged the applicants for food in such order that each took his or her turn in receiving the allotted portion. There was no scrambling, no pushing of others on one side, and none went unfed. The great majority took away with them their pilaf, or their stew, or whatever happened to be the provision for the day, in order to eat it at home.

For reasons of health our President, Damat Ferid, although he had visited several of the mosques and had satisfied himself that the distribution of food was being done satisfactorily, had to resign, and in doing so he and the Committee appointed me as chairman. We continued our work until the war was ended and the great mass of refugees had returned to their villages. Mr. Frew attended as our delegate at many of the villages in Thrace, and made admirable arrangements by which relief should be continued in order to enable the peasants to rebuild their houses. He always took care that what he delivered should be distri-

buted by the right people to the right people. He usually assembled the local authorities and arranged that the relief should be given publicly so that there should be no chance of speculation amongst those who distributed it. To conclude, the work of relief done by Lady Lowther's committee and the sub-committees under her, by the Friends' Relief Committee and by that which, during the later half of its existence, was under my chairmanship, was a humanitarian work of which England may well be proud.

CHAPTER XXII

AUGUST-OCTOBER, 1914

Lull Before the Storm—Turkish Ministers Favourable to England, Excepting Enver Pasha—Arrival of *Goeben* and *Breslau*—Constant Declarations of Neutrality by Turks—British Ships not Permitted to Pass Into the Aegean—Disadvantages of British Ambassador—Hard and Fast Rule Between Diplomatic and Consular Service—Irritation of Turks at Pre-emption of Ships Built in England—Constant Series of Attacks Against England in Constantinople—Finding Turks Would not Declare War Germans in Command of Turkish Fleet Bombard Odessa.

IN the spring of 1914 the only section of the population of Turkey which shewed any activity was the army. There was apparently no thought anywhere of the possibility of an outbreak of war. The Treaty of Bucharest signed August 9, 1913, seemed to mark the beginning of a peaceful period. We all saw its dangers, but did not anticipate they would lead to immediate trouble. Bulgaria was deeply depressed, but silently acquiescent. Exhausted in the first instance by her successful struggle against Turkey, and then by her second unhappy contest with Serbia and Greece, in which, while she was probably not blameless for precipitating a war, the conduct of her opponents in disposing not only of the contested district of Macedonia but of that which by treaty between the same Powers was recognised to belong to her, coupled with the intervention of Rumania, who declared war on Bulgaria July 10, 1913, resistance by Bulgaria became impossible. Enver Pasha had been allowed to reoccupy Adrianople, in spite of the promise given by the Entente that the Bulgarian boundary

between her territory and Turkey should be a line drawn from Enos to Media. The disposition made of Cavalla and Silistria could only be regarded as temporary. Nevertheless no one anticipated any immediate disturbance in the Balkan Peninsula. All the Balkan States desired peace.

It is of course easy to be wise after the event, but I can now recall many circumstances which ought to have warned me that a war was coming with Germany in which Turkey would have to take part. The attempts made by the Porte to bring about an understanding with Rumania, including two visits by Talaat Bey, and the failure of these efforts, followed by a visit made by the Czar in the month of June, 1914, to Constanza (under Turkish rule known as Kustenji), ought to have led us to ask ourselves why Rumania should at that moment be carefully cultivated, both by Turkey and Germany. The Turkish army was receiving greater attention than I had ever before known it to receive. The troops round Constantinople were drilling constantly. This we put down then to the recognition of the bad figure they had cut in battle against the Bulgarians and Serbs, but now can recognise that the considerable increase of German officers was not induced merely by the fear of further struggle with any Balkan State.

I was especially impressed by the extraordinary activity of the army when in June, 1914, I went to deliver the Commencement Address at the great American College at Marsovan. When I landed at Samsoun I found Turkish soldiers everywhere being carefully and thoroughly drilled. During my two days' drive into the interior we saw them encamped upon the hills, and everywhere occupied. The Turkish soldier was no longer the lethargic creature that I had known for forty years in time of peace. The discipline was evidently stricter, and the officers in particular left the impression that they expected soon to be called upon to march. This change of attitude in the army was confirmed when I reached Marsovan, for there not only were the troops more numerous than usual, but, with the arrogance that distinguishes them when they have a free hand and anticipate

active service, Turkish officers had attempted to invade the American collegiate premises under Dr. White, the President of the college, and it was only by the energetic pressure of Mr. Morgenthau that their illegal demands were successfully resisted. Upon my return to Constantinople, which would be, I think, in the first week in July, there was still no talk of war in any part of Europe.

The declaration by Austria against Serbia and the events which followed in quick succession came as a surprise to everybody, except perhaps the German authorities in Constantinople and Enver Pasha. But there is evidence from Turkey, as well as from other parts of Europe, that not only was the outbreak of war expected about this period, but that Germany had made her preparations before it broke out for forcing Turkey to take part in it. Munitions had been landed in Syria; the *Goeben* and the *Breslau* were in the Mediterranean; two magnificent German transports, the *Imperiali* and the *Corcovada*, had reached the Bosphorus laden with munitions.

The question for us in Constantinople was whether or no Turkey would be drawn into the struggle. The general impression there in July and until the end of August was that she would remain neutral. The Ministry in power was certainly not hostile either to England or to France. The Grand Vizier, Prince Said Halim, who came into power June 24, 1913, was popular both with Frenchmen and Englishmen, and I believe from first to last hoped and believed that Turkey could be kept out of the European quarrel. Talaat Bey, the strongest man in the Ministry, never, so far as I know, showed anything but friendly feelings towards the two great Western Powers. Jemal Bey, the Minister of Marine, had ostentatiously visited a Messagerie steamer moored to the Galata quay, which had on board a number of Frenchmen who were on the way to take part in the service of their country, and had cheered for France and was heartily cheered by a crowd of French and English. The two Christian members of the Cabinet, Bistani Effendi, Minister of Mines, and Oscan Effendi, the able Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, were well

disposed, so well-disposed, indeed, that it is believed that their resignation a little later was forced by two or three of the Chauvinist members of the Cabinet. Of such members Enver Pasha was the leader. He had naturally gained great reputation by his attempts to cut off communications between the Bulgarian army and Chatalja, and then to recapture Adrianople, in the latter attempt at which he had been successful. The best thing that can be said of Enver, and in justice must be said, is that in the darkest hour of Turkish troubles he had never despaired. After the Revolution he had been military attaché for a while at Berlin, and probably all through the period when he was Minister of War—having become so on the murder of Shevket Pasha—he was acting under German influence.

The German Ambassador was Baron von Wangenheim, who had come from Athens to the Porte. He is a man of conspicuous energy and pushfulness, of great ability and power of driving men to carry out his designs. When on August 11 the *Goeben* and the *Breslau* entered Turkish waters, Admiral Suchon, who was in command, shewed much of the same determined character. When these ships had passed the Dardanelles they should, in conformity with international law, have been disarmed. From the first the behaviour of the officers in command was one of insolence and defiance of international usages and even of the amenities of civilised life. Even while at the Dardanelles an instance of this occurred. The French Messagerie steamer *Saghalien*, with a number of Englishmen, Italians, and French subjects on board, was held up for a while at Chanak. The *Goeben*, which by international law had ceased to have the right to act as a belligerent once she had taken refuge in Turkish waters, insisted upon visiting the French ship. One may forgive her for destroying the telegraphic apparatus, though they had no legal right to do so, but the German officer should at least have behaved as most German naval officers do, like a gentleman. The passengers had ranged themselves on deck as the German crew returned to their boat, and the officer observed a gentlemanly looking man with a number of

papers sticking out of his breast-pocket. He went up to him, took one out, read the address and asked its owner who was the addressee. The owner replied, "She is my wife." "Then," said he, "you can write her another letter," tearing the envelope with its contents into pieces and throwing them on the deck.

It is no part of my story, which is better told in the White Paper issued by our Government in November, to shew how the Porte evaded its duties as a neutral power. Flagrant violations of international law went on daily, and the Porte had not the courage or perhaps the wish to do more than feebly remonstrate. German soldiers and sailors were coming to the Bosphorus by every boat from Constanza. Munitions of war were being poured into Turkey and were being sent for use, some to the Dardanelles, where the captain of a British merchant ship and his wife counted the mines intended to be laid in the Dardanelles as they were arranged in long lines on Turkish transports. We soon learned that others were intended for the coasts of Syria, of the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf.

Meantime our Embassy was being assured constantly that Turkey intended to remain neutral, that the sailors of the *Goeben* and the *Breslau* would be taken out of these vessels, and that nothing would induce Turkey to go to war. The Dardanelles was closed, and twenty-three British ships were not permitted to pass through into the Aegean. My son, who has taken over the bulk of my legal work for some years, was absent on a visit to England during August and September, and on one occasion in his absence nine splendid specimens of the masters of British merchant steamers came to my chambers in a body and asked me to advise them. It had been suggested to them by a British authority (for something not unlike a panic existed among some of our officials, though not in the general community) that they should lose no time but get up steam and proceed at once to the Black Sea, whence they had nearly all come. Knowing the situation, my advice was that they should do nothing of the sort, and I was glad to find that they all were of my

opinion. With the aid of Mr. Beaumont, the Embassy Counsellor, all these nine vessels ultimately got through into the Aegean. But the stoppage of the passage of British ships through the Dardanelles, the refusal of the Turks to give the firmans which are necessary for such passage, all showed that a section of the Turks expected shortly to be at war.

Now let me digress to speak of a somewhat delicate subject. The British Ambassador, Sir Louis Mallet, whose appointment dated from June, 1913, laboured under a series of disadvantages to which his German colleague was not subjected. Baron von Wangenheim had extremely competent interpreters or Dragomans. Nine months before the outbreak of the war we had at the British Embassy a Dragoman, Mr. Fitzmaurice, whose general intelligence, knowledge of Turkey, of its Ministers and people, and especially of the Turkish language, was, to say the least, equal to that of the best Dragoman which Germany ever possessed. His health had run down, and he had been given a holiday, but when, I think in the month of February, 1914, Sir Louis Mallet returned to Constantinople, Mr. Fitzmaurice did not return with him, and was never in Constantinople until after the outbreak of war with England. It is said that he did not return because the Turkish Ambassador in London made a request to that effect. I do not know whether the statement is true or not. I think it probable that if such a request were made it was because Mr. Fitzmaurice did not conceal his dislike of the policy which the Young Turks were pursuing. In this respect he and I often differed, and have spent hours in discussing the policy of the Young Turks. But as his ability and loyalty to his chief is beyond question, and as he possesses a quite exceptional knowledge of the Turkish Empire, and had proved himself a most useful public servant, both in his investigation of the massacres in Armenia, at Urfa and other places, and at a later period in acting with the representative of the Indian Government in settling the boundary of the Aden district, it was nothing short of a national misfortune that he did not return with Sir Louis Mallet.

Though differing in opinion from Mr. Fitzmaurice, I invariably found him reasonable and well-informed; I had formed the highest opinion of his value as a Dragoman. It goes without saying that he would carry out any instructions which his chief gave him. It was therefore a matter of profound regret to everyone in Constantinople who knew that he had recovered from his illness, to learn that he was not permitted to return. For now, what was the condition of our Embassy when it had to strive against Baron von Wangenheim with his superbly equipped staff? Sir Louis Mallet, so far as I know, had never had experience in Turkey. He did not know a word of Turkish. He had under him three Secretaries. Mr. Beaumont, the Counsellor, especially during the days in August before his chief returned from a visit to England, was busy almost night and day on the shipping cases, many of which passed through my hands. He also knows nothing of Turkish and had never had experience in Turkey. Mr. Ovey, the First Secretary, also had never been in Turkey, and knew nothing of Turkish. Unfortunately also he was taken somewhat seriously ill. The next Secretary was Lord Gerald Wellesley, a young man who will probably be a brilliant and distinguished diplomatist twenty years hence, but, like his colleagues, had no experience in Turkey. The situation of our Embassy under the circumstances was lamentable. The ever active Germans, arming Turkey as rapidly as they could, bringing in munitions of war and distributing them throughout the empire, defying international rules and treating the Porte almost as a negligible quantity, refusing to land the crews of the two famous ships; all under a strenuous Ambassador and a fully equipped staff of Turkish scholars to help him. The contrast between the two Embassies was all too marked.

It was made worse than it might have been from the mischievous general rule of our Foreign Office, which erects an almost impassable barrier between the Consular and Diplomatic Services, a barrier which I have long desired to see broken down. When, some months afterwards, I returned to England, I received a copy of the "Appendix to

the Fifth Report of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service," published on July 16, 1914, in which (on page 321) there is a letter written by me two years earlier in which I made two recommendations. The first was adopted, the second unfortunately was not. I claimed that the Consular and Diplomatic Services should be so co-ordinated that a good man in the Consular Service in Turkey might be promoted into the Diplomatic Service, and I instanced the case of Sir William White, one of the ablest Ambassadors we ever had in Constantinople, who had risen from being a consular clerk to the Embassy. The facts under my notice from July to the end of October, 1914, afforded strong proof of the common sense of my recommendation. The inexperience of the Ambassador and his staff heavily handicapped British diplomacy in Turkey: yet there were three men who had been or were in the Consular Service whose help would have been invaluable. They had each proved themselves able Dragomans and had each many years' experience in Turkey. The only explanation that I can give of why their services were not at once made available in the absence of Fitzmaurice was the absurd restriction to which I have alluded.

The first of these three was Sir Adam Block, who had been Chief Dragoman at the Embassy, and whose services, knowledge of Turkish, and common sense had been highly appreciated by Sir William White and Sir Philip Currie. He, however, had become the representative of the British and Dutch bondholders in the Department of the Public Debt. It is no secret that he was occasionally consulted by Sir Louis Mallet, but he could not conceal the fact that his position was likely to lead to a serious conflict of duties. As President of the Public Debt he was a Turkish official. The two other men whose services might have been immediately commandeered by the British Foreign Office were Mr. Lamb, a man who also had been Chief Dragoman at the Embassy, but who for private reasons had chosen to exchange that post for the Consul-Generalship at Salonica. He knows Turkey almost from end to end, and speaks Turkish well. The other Englishman was Mr. Robert Graves, who has

occupied consular posts from Erzeroum in the Far East to the Island of Crete in the extreme west of the empire. Both these gentlemen combine the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re* to a quite exceptional degree. Each would be absolutely unyielding in carrying out the instructions of an Ambassador, and each could have given him valuable advice suggested by his knowledge of the Turks and the country. Each also is so well acquainted with the amenities of civilised life to which Turkish Ministers are peculiarly susceptible, that they would be prepared to convey the stiffest message necessary and yet be recognised as having conveyed it as gentlemen should. If Sir Louis Mallet was unwilling to disarrange the Department of Public Debt by having Sir Adam Block constantly as his adviser, one of the latter two should have been taken over by him. It might be truthfully answered that the Grand Vizier speaks English well, and that with him there was no need of a Dragoman. But he is the only Minister of whom this can be said. Moreover the Dragoman's services were wanted for his knowledge of the country and Turkish character and politics quite as much as for interpreting.

We all saw by the middle of October that Turkey was drifting into war. We all regretted the situation and asked ourselves whether it might not have been avoided by England. Briefly resumed, the position was the following : The Turkish Ministry had repeatedly declared its intention of remaining neutral. The Grand Vizier, Prince Said Halim, had given almost daily assurances, first to Mr. Beaumont and then to Sir Louis Mallet on his return to Constantinople, to this effect. Talaat Bey, the Minister of the Interior, who impressed those whom he met in England five years ago with a certain openness and frankness of character, was mainly anxious to have the integrity and independence of the empire guaranteed by England and France, and this guaranty had been given. No one would have pronounced him weak. Jemal, the Minister of Marine, I have already described as having friendly feelings towards the Entente. Hallil Bey was also regarded as friendly. The two Christian members

of the Government, Bistani and Oscan, were avowedly in favour of the Entente if the attitude of neutrality could not be maintained. The Sheik-ul-Islam was understood to be in favour of the policy proclaimed by Said Halim and spoke of attacks upon Russia as madness. The only Minister who was openly unfavourable to the Entente was Enver, and it had already become clear that he had thrown in his lot heart and soul with the Germans. Baron von Wangenheim, General Liman von Sanders, the leading military German officer as Admiral Suchon was of the Navy, and still in command of the *Goeben*, formed a strong combination.

Popular sentiment was inflamed by many circumstances and by a propaganda against England which is reasonably suspected to have been largely incited by Enver and the German Embassy. Turkish shops in Stambul produced maps of Turkey shewing the enormous amount of territory which she had lost since the formation of the Balkan League. But so far as popular sentiment could be estimated, it was not with the war party, although Enver Pasha was acclaimed throughout the capital and empire as the hero who had recovered Adrianople. Mobilisation during August and the first half of September was pushed rapidly forward. We in Constantinople asked against whom were these preparations being made. Greece was the first country generally suggested, for the Greeks in Thrace and in the province of Aidin had been grossly maltreated. In the Balkan war the Greek fleet had been successful, no boat in the Turkish service being a match for the *Averoff*. Soon, however, the preparations in the army were seen to be much more important than those in the navy, and therefore the suggestion that Greece was the object of attack had to be abandoned. Then the popular impression was that the British were to be driven out of Egypt. There was, however, little or no hostile feeling against the British, and gradually popular opinion settled down to the belief that Russia was to be the country attacked, which meant of course that Turkey would join Germany and Austria. It was predicted that on September 18 the

Turkish fleet would steam out into the Black Sea and give challenge to the Russian fleet.

Looking back over the situation in September and October, 1914, in Constantinople, it appears probable that these rumours were carefully spread by the Germans. I remember that on September 19 and the few following days the *Goeben* and the *Breslau* were anchored off Moda Point, the southern extremity of the Bosphorus on the Asiatic side. Three-fourths of the crews wore German naval uniforms. Meantime, daily, munitions of war and Germans were being poured into Turkey through Rumania. Every indication at that time shewed that the Germans were determined to force Turkey into war. The White Paper issued by our Government shews that Sir Louis Mallet was informed on various occasions by Turkish Ministers themselves that the Germans were urging them to commit hostilities. I can imagine that a British Ambassador, in pre-telegraphic days, who, seeing what was going on, and especially noting the refusal of the Germans to accede to the Turkish demand that German sailors from the two ships mentioned should be put on shore, would have said to the Grand Vizier, "You must put these sailors on shore within twenty-four hours or send me my passports." But we laymen, with our necessarily limited knowledge of the diplomatic situation and of the needs of our Allies, recognised that there might be other facts which would influence our judgment. I gather from the White Paper that the English Ambassador had to follow the example of his French colleague, and so during the latter end of September and October we were living under a German dictatorship. Twenty-five British ships were during several days prevented from passing through the Dardanelles. The cargoes of those which had coals or cereals were either compulsorily bought or commandeered. The entrances from the Black Sea to the Bosphorus and from the Dardanelles to the Aegean were strewn with mines, and many steamers, British and French, were detained.

For a while the Censor only permitted news of the European war to appear which had been transmitted by Wolff's

telegrams. These were so obviously false that a not uncommon jest was heard that "there were lies, d—— lies, and Wolff's telegrams." The French Embassy had to insist upon the publication of its official news to counteract the false statements of Wolff. These, together with similar official statements from the British and Russian embassies, had a useful effect.

It would not be right in this resumé to pass over the effect produced on Turkish opinion by the exercise of its right of pre-emption by our Government over the two powerful ships built in England for the Turks, the *Reshadie* and the *Sultan Osman*. The German and Government papers in Constantinople constantly harped upon the injustice done by England in exercising such right. It is not too much to say that its exercise was the most powerful weapon which the German party possessed in Constantinople against the British Government. The unsettled question of the Greek islands had occupied the Turkish Government after the Treaty of Bucarest more than any other. Turkey desired to regain Mitylene and Chios and recognised that the great obstacle was the inferiority of its fleet to that of Greece. The prediction was everywhere heard in the spring of 1914 that when the new ships reached Turkey this inferiority would cease. The common belief was that as soon as these vessels were ready for sea, M. Venezelos, the Greek Premier, would himself declare war, and thus compel England to put her own law into force and prevent their leaving her shores. Hence their construction had been hurried on in every possible way by the Turks. The popular idea was that as soon as they should reach the Dardanelles they would be sent to Salonica and simultaneously a large Turkish army would make a rush from Dédéagatch along the shore of the Aegean to co-operate with the fleet against Salonica. A common report was that Bulgaria had consented to an arrangement by which her opposition would be bought off in return for her receiving the port of Cavalla. The pre-emption of the two ships knocked the bottom out of these predictions and the Turkish disappointment was intense. The papers

inspired by Germany in Constantinople spoke of the act as piracy, as a blow aimed solely at Turkey. It was a bully's attack on a small state. The idea was carefully spread throughout the army. In one camp of newly collected troops I was informed by a person present that an official marched up and down declaring that they were always to remember that "England is the enemy. England is the enemy." The *Osmanische Lloyd*, a subsidised German paper published in Constantinople, which has been for years an absolutely unscrupulous enemy of England, treated its readers day after day to charges of bad faith by our country. There was no English paper in existence, for the *Levant Herald* had ceased publication; nor was there any paper which was not censored in such a manner that the impression grew that the Censor was himself a German. Many statements were industriously circulated through the local press in order to produce a sentiment of hostility towards England, and the one to which apparently the most importance was attached was that the Moslems of India were on the point of rising to attack England as the enemy of Islam. It is possible that the Kaiser himself believed the statement, as apparently he did others, that civil war would break out in Ireland between the Nationalists and the men of Ulster, that South Africa would immediately revolt, that Egypt would be lost to England if war broke out, and that Pan-Islamism would at once take a large development. Our Embassy gave a severe blow to the nonsense about India by summaries of facts shewing how the Moslem Princes and people were united in support of the King-Emperor, how Agha Khan was entirely loyal, and how the Committee of the Islamic League of All India urged all Moslem States not to be caught up in the whirlwind of the Great War, and advised Turkey to remain neutral.

I wrote to *The Contemporary Review* on October 6 last, declaring that during the week beginning September 28 the Germans had used all their influence upon the Turks to induce them to join in the European War; that the impression both of Turks and foreigners was that the Porte was

being urged to adopt a provocative policy, and that the order to close the Dardanelles on a perfectly absurd pretext was given by a German officer in command at Chanak ; that the German Suchon Pasha, in command of the *Goeben*, was in reality in command of the Turkish fleet and disregarded all Turkish authority ; that the Germans were profuse in their promises if Turkey would join them, and expressed themselves as alone able to save Turkey from Russia. In spite of German promises and threats, the *vis inertiae* of the Turkish people and the common sense of their Ministers still favoured neutrality. In spite of all the inducements held out to them they were unwilling to join in the war. They would have been unanimously and heartily on the side of England and France had it not been known that we were in alliance with Russia. It was perhaps too much to expect that a people should suddenly forget the tradition of many generations during which Russia has always been the enemy.

I am convinced, however, that Baron von Wangenheim and his associates came to recognise that by unaided diplomacy it was impossible to overcome the reluctance of the Turkish people to engage in war on the side of Germany. Something had to be done in order to overcome the decision of the Grand Vizier and the majority of the Ministers in favour of neutrality. It is true that they had shewn themselves weak in permitting the entry of the *Goeben* and the *Breslau* and in not insisting upon their being disarmed. Promises had been made without stint. Crete would be given back to Turkey, the Capitulations would be abolished. Money would be forthcoming. £1,200,000 in bar-gold had actually been received by the Germans before the end of October. Admiral Limpus and his British staff had already been replaced by Germans. Nevertheless the Ministry believed that neutrality could be maintained so long as Turkey was inactive. In spite of the urgent demands of the Germans, the Turkish Government would not declare war. A family council was held at the palace in the early days of October at the demand of Izzedin, the Crown Prince, when a resolution was adopted that no declaration of war should be

made without the consent of such body. The meaning of the resolution was that Enver Pasha, to whom the majority of those present were opposed, was already believed to be doing his utmost to rush Turkey into an act of war. The Grand Vizier himself had declared that under no circumstances would he consent to make war upon France and England. Such was the position at the end of October. The policy of the Entente in Turkey seemed to us to be one of quiet confidence in Turkish assurances. That of the war party at the instigation of Germany was one of unscrupulous pushfulness.

An incident occurred in Constantinople on the evening of October 29, the day on which Odessa was bombarded, which raises a strong presumption that the attack was a surprise to all the Turkish Ministers, with the exception probably of Enver. At a dinner where a few Englishmen, all well known to me, were present, a telegram giving the Odessa news created consternation. One of the intended diners had seen Jemal Pasha, the Minister of Marine, only two hours earlier, and he and others expressed the opinion that the telegram could not be true. All recognised that if it were it meant war. Accordingly one of those present was sent off at once by motor-car to see Jemal. Not finding him at his house, he followed him to a club, called him into a private room, and showed him the telegram. Jemal went green, expressed intense and genuine surprise or incredulity, and swore on the head of his daughter—an oath which no Turk lightly utters—that he, Minister of Marine though he was, knew nothing of the matter. He expressed his belief that Talaat Bey, Minister of the Interior, was in like ignorance. Talaat was immediately communicated with, and professed complete ignorance. Then Enver Pasha was rung up, and declared that he had just received a telegram to the like effect as that referred to. Whether or no he expressed complete ignorance of such an incident having been arranged, I do not know. The Grand Vizier emphatically repudiated any foreknowledge of the incident. Turkey had been forced into war.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR AT CONSTANTINOPLE

I Wish to Remain in Constantinople After Declaration of War—I am Arrested—Imprisoned—Released by Intervention of the American Ambassador—I Leave Constantinople—Journey to Dédéagatch—Thence to Piræus, Malta, Marseilles, and England—Incidents of the Voyage—Noble Conduct of Mr. and Mrs. Morgenthau Towards French and British Refugees—The Y.M.C.A. in Constantinople.

WHEN Turkey declared war upon England on October 29, 1914, I had to decide whether I should leave the country or not. I was not unprepared for the question, because it had become evident to me that the Turks were unable to resist German pressure, and I had determined that if possible I would remain in Constantinople. The situation was intensely interesting and I dreamed of recording its developments. Early in November a German friend, who is at once a scholar and a gentleman, stopped me in the street with the remark : " Sir Edwin, you have written *The Destruction of the Greek Empire* ; I think you are going to live to write the *Destruction of the Turkish Empire*."

I replied, " Hush ! such things should not be said in a Pera street."

" Still, I believe it is true. I like the Turks, but I think they are committing suicide."

We parted, and I am sure that the opinion of my friend, though he must have recognised that it was German influence that had driven them into war, was an honest one. He had

lived many years in Turkey, spoke Turkish like a Turk, and has been known to me for many years as a man of good judgment.

It was indeed my hope that I should be permitted to remain, and therefore when I saw the departure of the Ambassador and Consul and their staffs, and of nearly all of the British community who could afford to get away, it did not greatly alarm me. I knew that I had, as I trust I still have, many friends amongst the best Turks and among the Young Turkey Party now in power, and I fully recognised that the nation had been driven into war by the pushfulness and the persistency of the Germans, aided by Enver Pasha, the Minister of War.

The Turk is not a spiteful man, and I had done nothing that would make him personally hostile to me. I was the legal adviser until his death of Prince Halim, father of the Grand Vizier. I do not believe that either Prince Said Halim or his brothers have any unkindly feeling towards me. The last time I saw Talaat Bey, the Minister of the Interior, was in the early summer of 1914 in the island of Prinkipo, where he, with Dilber Effendi, a distinguished senator, met me out walking with my youngest son and got out of their carriage to greet me and have a friendly talk. Unprompted by any outsider, I do not believe that any one of the Ministers would have objected to my remaining. I had taken a sympathetic interest in the development of Ottoman Constitutionalism, and the remark of Hakki Pasha shewed that he correctly understood what was my attitude to the Government.

It was, however, reported to me that Baron von Wangenheim urged my expulsion, and I believe it. To the reply made to him, that while I had criticised the Party in power I had always defended it against the adherents of Abdul Hamid, he retorted that I had begun the opposition to Turkey in Western Europe by exposing what I called the Moslem outrages in Bulgaria. The diplomat to whom he was talking I think knew little or nothing of the events of 1876. To this statement, which he regarded as ancient history, he

replied: "Surely there is such a thing as prescription in these matters?"

When the story was told me I answered that I gloried in what I had done in reference to Bulgaria and in my protests against the Armenian massacres. But the incident is interesting as showing the thoroughness with which the German diplomatist will carry out his object. His idea probably was that there should be no Englishman left in Turkey who would be capable of reporting what the Germans were doing.

I was informed that the immediate cause of hostility and of action against me was that four members of the Khedival family had been arrested. Thereupon the order had been given that the four leading members of the British Community were to be treated in the same way. Of course in war time no objection to such an order being given can be successfully made. War is war. I was informed, however, by Mr. Morgenthau, the American Ambassador in Constantinople, that in the middle of November he had seen both Enver Pasha and Talaat Bey, and had been promised by each of them on their word of honour that neither I nor Dr. A. van Millingen, Professor of History at Robert College, should be molested. It was therefore a surprise to me when, entirely without warning, on Monday, November 30, the police entered my chambers, packed up the contents in sacks, including everything in my safe, and then proceeded to my house and made a similar seizure there. A friend who was with me in my chambers was not permitted to leave, nor was I allowed to use the telephone.

The packing up of my papers occupied the whole of the morning. I was taken to my private house, and this again occupied, with lunch, a matter of two or three hours. Then, always accompanied by two secret police agents, I was taken across to Stambul, to a building set aside as a prison for non-Turkish subjects. When I arrived there I was shewn into a room, requested to turn out my pockets, and passed into the common room. I suppose it was about twenty feet long by thirteen broad. There were about five-and-twenty

men in it—several Russians, three or four Frenchmen, and two or three Egyptians who had spoken approvingly of British rule. The room was filthy, and contained only one chair—an old one. The occupants were naturally interested in the new-comer, but treated me with great respect and even kindness, insisting that I should take possession of the chair. There I remained for two hours.

What passed in my absence was the following. As soon as the friend who had been in my chambers was allowed to go free, he at once went to the American Embassy and found that the Ambassador had gone over to Stambul. He, however, saw the First Secretary, who remarked when he heard the story that Mr. Morgenthau would be greatly annoyed, because to his knowledge Enver Pasha and Talaat Bey had given the Ambassador their word of honour that I should not be molested.

The Secretary immediately tried by telephone to find where the Ambassador was, and got into communication with him while he was in Talaat Bey's room. On hearing the news, he at once turned to Talaat with the remark: "You have violated your word of honour! You have arrested Sir Edwin Pears. I am going to have him out and take him back in my motor-car."

Talaat said he had forgotten that he had pledged his word, but added that he could not release me because the matter had passed out of his hands into those of Bedri Bey, the Minister of Police.

"Then," said Mr. Morgenthau, "send for him immediately, because I am not going to leave until I know that Sir Edwin is free."

It was probably an hour before Bedri could be found. Let me say in passing that Bedri is probably a typical chief gaoler, educated in the school of Abdul Hamid. He at once opposed every objection possible. He was only an executive officer, and a decision (according to him) having been given by the Council of Ministers, he could not release me.

"Decision or no decision," said Mr. Morgenthau, "you, Enver Pasha, and Talaat Bey pledged your word to me as

Ambassador of the United States, and I intend that word to be respected."

Then followed a somewhat hot discussion. Bedri proposed to bargain and suggested that I should be released, but should leave the country within forty-eight hours. Mr. Morgenthau contemptuously replied, "Absurd!"

Mr. Morgenthau in telling me the story said he was anxious that I should not spend the night in a Turkish prison and that, once out, a bargain might be made as to the time of departure or even as to remaining in Constantinople.

Finally, to cut this part of the story short, it was agreed that I should be released at once but should leave the country within a fortnight.

"I want him now," said Mr. Morgenthau, "and I am going to take him with me."

They, however, begged him not to insist upon this condition, claiming that as he was the Ambassador of a Great Power it would have an unfortunate effect in the Community if it were known that he had ostentatiously taken me from prison to my house. Like the man of consummate common sense that he is, Mr. Morgenthau said:

"Provided he is released immediately I will not insist upon that condition; but I am now going to the Embassy, and if he is not home by a quarter past six I shall return, and whatever may be the consequences will not leave this place until I have him with me."

He then drove off to Pera to see my wife, to inform her of the promise that had been given, and relieve her anxiety. To my daughter, who was with her, our house not being more than three hundred yards from the Embassy, he said:

"I shall keep my chauffeur in attendance, and at 6.15 precisely, unless you telephone me that your father has arrived, I shall go back to fetch him."

At about half-past five I was fetched out of prison, brought before the officer in charge, and informed that I was at liberty. The streets were already dark, but when I got down to Galata bridge I found a carriage and reached home at five minutes past six, to the delight of my wife and daughter.

Mr. Morgenthau was at once telephoned to, and within five minutes three men from the Embassy came round to congratulate me and learn the details of the news.

On the following day Mrs. Morgenthau and her husband came round to see Lady Pears and myself, and to discuss the question whether or not I should remain. Needless to say, my wife and I had discussed it fully before their arrival. After considerable hesitation we decided that I should leave. My wife declared she would not leave, and especially for the following reason : the Turks had not up to that time, nor so far as I can learn up to the moment of this book going to press, molested any British woman in Turkey or plundered a British house in which British occupants remained. I cannot repeat too often that the Turk bears no ill-will to Englishmen. We knew, however, of two instances of friends who had quitted the country and whose houses were visited next day by the police and ransacked. We knew also of houses where women only remained in which the contents had not been touched. My wife was unwilling to see her drawing-room and the belongings of our house, which is full of friendly associations ranging over upwards of a quarter of a century, pass into the hands of spoilers.

I put these considerations to Mr. and Mrs. Morgenthau, and while they agreed that if I remained I should probably be subject to constant worry, they also thought that it was unlikely that my wife and daughter would be molested. Mrs. Morgenthau in her kindly way added :

“ They will not be molested, but if they are I will take both of them into my house and treat them as sister and daughter.”

Mr. Morgenthau supported his wife's statement, and thereupon I decided to leave Turkey.

I left Constantinople on December 9, 1914. Many friends of various nationalities went to the station to see me off. The only exit at that time from the country was by the railway to the Bulgarian frontier and thence to Dédéagatch. After a wearisome journey our train arrived at that port. During the next two days I had the opportunity of judging

of its miserable capacity as the sole seaport on the Aegean for Bulgaria. I, however, met with great kindness from Bulgarians and others. On the Friday morning another train arrived from Constantinople, bringing between seventy and eighty French subjects, the majority of whom were nuns. On Saturday a French steamer arrived and was soon crowded with passengers. On Sunday morning, under the beautiful sky of the Aegean Indian summer, mass was celebrated on the upper deck. To me the ceremony was interesting, but the faces of the nuns were pathetic. There was one old lady in particular who was said to be eighty-five years old and who looked upwards of ninety, and both on this memorable Sunday morning and during the voyage, it was "just lovely," as an American lady observed to me, to see the kindliness and devotion of the nuns to their dear old sister. In the course of the service three hymns were sung, one of which invoked the aid of the Virgin upon the arms of France.

From breakfast-time until sunset we had the glorious peak of Mount Athos on our starboard towering with its 8,000 feet well above a great bank of clouds. On Monday we arrived in the Piræus, and I took the opportunity of running up to Athens and calling at our Legation. Sir Francis Elliot, the son of Sir Henry, shewed me a telegram that he had received from my daughter in Egypt asking news of me in consequence of her having seen a telegram announcing my arrest. I was unfortunately unable to accept his invitation to lunch, because the steamer had arranged to leave shortly after one o'clock.

On the following day we arrived at Malta. I may mention that before leaving Constantinople I had arranged a programme to send relief as far as possible to the many hundreds of distressed Maltese subjects remaining in the city. As soon as our steamer anchored under the protection of the Union Jack, I landed, and went at once to the house of Admiral Limpus. I had the good fortune to find him and his family at home, and was received by them with all the charm that had endeared them to everybody whom they had met in Constantinople. Before dinner I discussed the proposal

for the relief already mentioned, and the Admiral at once promised his assistance. As I was unable to accept an invitation to remain on shore for the night, the Admiral kindly took me on board before eleven. One of the special subjects of interest in our conversation was the now famous destruction of the *Messudieh*, which, as the flagship of the Admiral, was well known to him and his family. No less than seventeen French men-of-war were in the harbour at Malta, and Admiral Limpus spoke with enthusiasm of the French officers and of the manner they had marked out the Western Mediterranean and kept it clear for the safety of all travelling upon it. On the following day we proceeded to Marseilles, and then without any incident of more than personal interest, I pushed on to London, where I arrived on the 21st, delighted to see once more the white faces of my countrymen and their children.

Before leaving Turkey several British and French subjects asked me to give expression to the gratitude they felt towards the American Ambassador, Mr. Morgenthau, and his wife for their watchful and kindly attention, since the outbreak of the war, to the members of the two communities. All British, French, and Belgian subjects in Turkey had been placed under American protection on the declaration of war. The amount of extra work which this entailed on the Ambassador and his staff was enormous. From early morning to late evening during several weeks both Embassy and Consulate were crowded with fugitives anxious to escape from Turkey. During these weeks I saw crowds of men and women, nuns and priests, filling the corridors, and at the Consulate reaching half-way across the street, waiting their turn to be registered under American protection. Two British officials had remained behind for the identification of subjects. The Turks during the Turco-Italian war had behaved not unkindly to Italian subjects, but things were now changed. Behind the Turks were the Germans, and most of them shewed, so far as I could learn, no kindness to anybody. Every kind of obstacle was placed in the

way of British and French subjects, and especially of British, Turkish officials declaring that they intended to make reprisals for what our people had done in Egypt. Mr. Morgenthau used his utmost endeavours to obtain the police passes, necessary in addition to the registration papers obtainable at the American Consulate in order to allow British subjects to leave. Many were detained in order that they might be forced to produce receipts for the payment of a poll-tax known as *temetu*.

On various occasions Mr. Morgenthau was present at seven o'clock in the morning when the train left, usually accompanied by his secretary, Mr. Tarler, to whom also the British and French communities were greatly indebted. Mr. Morgenthau had constantly to intervene in order to get rid of objections urged merely to cause delay. On one occasion he stated with considerable warmth to the police-officers that he himself would pay out of his own pocket any *temetu* which were found due. Some of the most distressing cases were those of nuns. All these women had been engaged in educational and charitable work, and I do not believe that the Turks alone would have compelled them to leave the country if they had not been under the influence of the Germans. The hardships necessarily attending the journeying of these women, nearly all of whom had come from the interior of Asia Minor, were heartrending even to hear. One especially gross case was mentioned to me by some of the nuns and confirmed by a priest who had been occupied in their neighbourhood. Instead of being permitted to go from the place where they were stationed directly to Samsun, where they could have been transported easily by sea to the capital, they had been intentionally sent round by a different route, which entailed a week's further journey over a country without roads. Mr. and Mrs. Morgenthau, who are Jews, behaved magnificently to these Latin Christians throughout this period of stress and trial.

Let me give instances: without notice the police closed the Girls' School of the Dames de Sion at Kadikewi, a suburb of Constantinople on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. The

girls were bundled out into the street ; the sisters were told to leave immediately, and the police took possession of the building. When the Mother Superior and a few others crossed the Bosphorus and landed in Galata they were rudely told they must at once go back. When Mrs. Morgenthau heard what had been done, she at once borrowed the steam-launch attached to the Embassy, took with her a secretary and a dragoman, and crossed over to Kadikewi. Her presence alone gave the poor women consolation, for they understood that they would be taken care of by her.

Mrs. Morgenthau and her husband started off on another occasion at eight o'clock on a cold November morning to see for themselves how the sisters were being treated at Chichly, about two miles from the Embassy. They arrived in time to learn that all of them had been locked up by the police and were greatly alarmed. The Ambassador insisted on their being set free. Subsequently a German officer, who claimed that he had been charged to protect them independently of the American Ambassador, was properly snubbed when he caused a telephonic message to be transmitted to the Embassy.

The personal interest which Mr. and Mrs. Morgenthau took in the refugees, and especially in the sisters and other women, deserves too high praise for me to attempt to express it. It would have been impertinent to attempt to estimate how much she and her husband had contributed out of their own pockets. I can only say that on board the French steamer, one after the other told me of presents of chocolate and sandwiches and of other comforts which enabled them to support the weary journey from the capital to Dédéagatch. I can testify that the recipients, nuns and priests, were deeply grateful, and if these two Israelites were prayed for by members of a great Christian community their prayers were an expression of thankfulness to God, for having sent them such benefactors, and to the benefactors themselves.

Let me conclude this part of my subject by saying that American generosity has furnished the means in

Constantinople of establishing a Y.M.C.A. At its first annual meeting, as near as I can remember in the month of September, 1914, a crowded room shewed that the Institution was appreciated by Greeks, Armenians, Turks, Jews, and subjects of various European States. Mr. Morgenthau took the chair and alluded to the apparent incongruity of his acting as President of a Christian Association. The only other speakers on the programme were, I believe, myself and my friend Mr. Frew, on whom his University, that of Glasgow, has within the last few weeks conferred the well-merited honour of LL.D. The only remark of any consequence which I made was that Jews and Christians were agreed that for Turkey as well as for other countries we wanted to put into practice the teaching of Micah, "to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly in presence of Allah."

It will interest readers to know that the Y.M.C.A. of Constantinople has the warm and practical sympathy of the two Patriarchs of the Orthodox and Armenian Churches respectively, and is not without support from the leading dignitaries of the Latin Church in Constantinople. The present representative in Constantinople of our English Church, the Rev. Dr. Wigram, who was for ten years attached to the Archbishop's Nestorian mission, has at all times been ready to give the Y.M.C.A. his aid. Let me add in reference to him that two months ago Dr. Wigram played the part of a man. When at the instigation of the Germans fifty Englishmen were selected to be sent down to Gallipoli in order that they might stand their chance in the bombardment of that city, Dr. Wigram claimed that one man who was married and had a family should be released, and that he, Dr. Wigram, should be sent in his place. The authorities objected that as a priest they had nothing against him and that he was privileged to remain free. He protested and his claim was, I believe, supported by Mr. Morgenthau. He played the game and voluntarily placed himself as a substitute for the father of a family. It is satisfactory to note that as soon as Sir Edward Grey declared in the House of Commons that if any of the hostages were killed England

would hold the Grand Vizier and Enver Pasha personally responsible, the hostages were taken back to Constantinople and released.

I may be permitted to mention that immediately after the visit of Mr. and Mrs. Morgenthau to Chichly they went to the English High School for Girls, of which for many years I have been chairman. They found that the police had entered it, had ordered the children there and then to be sent home, and one of the police had been extremely rude to our Principal, Miss Charters. It happened that when the Ambassador arrived the chief of police, Bedri Bey, came in at the same moment. Our Principal reported the insolence to the Ambassador, who at once took the matter up, and the culprit had to eat very humble pie.

CHAPTER XXIV

SHORT AND PERSONAL

ON the occasion of my being knighted, June, 1909, I received a great number of congratulatory letters from men of all shades of political opinion. Before I left London, after receiving the accolade, the *Daily News* gave a lunch in my honour at the Whitehall Rooms. Three members of the Government were present, and two others sent expressions of regret that Parliamentary duties prevented their attendances. Mr. A. G. Gardner, the editor, was in the chair, and the gathering included many of the leading men in England who had sympathised with the Young Turks in shaking off Abdul Hamid's tyranny, and of those who a generation earlier had helped Bulgaria to obtain her freedom and who were doing what little they could to assist the Armenians. Among the veterans were Lord Eversley and Mr. Frederic Harrison. Among the younger men were Professor Bury, Mr. Edward Atkin, and many others, including my two youngest sons.

The many kindly statements made by the Chairman and other speakers marked a high appreciation of my services, and were intensely gratifying to me. Not the least pleasant were the kindly notices in the leading conservative papers.

On my return to Constantinople the greetings that I there received were equally agreeable. Amongst the many letters was one shewn though not addressed to me by one of the partners of the leading British firm in Smyrna, which said, " You cannot imagine how the knighting has touched the whole of the British community in this place. Every-

body feels that it is an honour conferred upon our community, and we are each and all proud of it."

Six or seven years earlier I had been unanimously elected, during my absence in England, President of the Prinkipo Yachting Club, a flourishing institution which includes Turks, Greeks, Armenians, and subjects of nearly every European State. The leading members insisted on giving me a public dinner in recognition of the honour which King Edward had conferred upon me. A few weeks later, when the Pera population had returned from the Bosphorus and the islands to their winter residences, I learned that certain members of the Turkish Bar had arranged with the leaders of the European Bar to give a dinner in my honour. The oldest member of the European Bar (which is open to the advocates of all European States except Turkey), Maître Rosasco, an Italian, presided and was supported by two Moslem colleagues. Here again I do not propose to give any but the most general account of what was said, but the commonest remark was that the incident was unprecedented for Constantinople. "Such a gathering," said one of the speakers, "of jurists representing every important European nation has probably not taken place in Constantinople since the time of Justinian." The proceedings were naturally in French and were of an enthusiastic character. Most of the speakers had more often been my legal opponents than my colleagues. One in particular, Dr. L. F. Mizzi, declared that he had fought me continuously during nearly forty years. It was pleasant to hear that I was regarded by all as a staunch colleague and a fair fighting adversary. A Belgian pronounced a brilliant eulogy, an Austrian could say nothing but what was flattering, an Italian, with the flow of musical language characteristic of his nation, put me upon an imaginary trial in which he brought all sorts of charges against me of which an advocate ought not to be guilty, and dismissed them one after another, to the great amusement of his audience. It was a gathering of my many years' colleagues to be remembered with satisfaction to the day of my death.

CHAPTER XXV

THE PAST AND THE FUTURE

Among the Archæologists—Rev. John Peters—Professor Hilprecht—George Smith—Hittite Investigators—Mr. Hogarth, Mr. Garstang, and Professor Sayce—Distinguished Explorers for the Palestine Exploration Fund—My Archæological Work in Constantinople—Rev. Dr. van Millingen—Bishops of Salisbury, Peterborough, and Gibraltar—Dr. Spooner, Canon Shoobridge, and Other Clergymen—Visit of Mr. Choate, Ambassador, to St. James's—Visits to Renowned Historical Sites, Ephesus Especially—British Colony in Turkey—Thoughts on the Future of Turkey and Notably of Constantinople.

IN compiling this volume of reminiscences my difficulty has been to know what to omit. I can truthfully say that my life in Turkey has been a full one. The time has passed all too rapidly.

I have said practically nothing about my legal practice and nothing of certain incidents which arose on the occasions when I was "acting" judge; but I should like to say something of my occupation and interests outside my profession.

My residence in Constantinople brought me the constant pleasure of intercourse with leading archæologists. I have already spoken of Troy and my acquaintance with Dr. Schliemann and Dr. Paspates. One of the subjects which first deeply interested me was the discovery of Nippur, the Calneh of Genesis x. 10. To the Rev. John Peters, an Episcopal clergyman of New York, belongs the honour of first having uncovered the Mound of Nippur, which is just outside the bounds of Mesopotamia. On his leaving for America his task

was continued by Professor Hilprecht for the Pennsylvania University. The result of their working has been to push back the records of Sumian civilisation certainly 7000, probably 8000 years B.C. The thousands of inscriptions on clay tablets and on stone which exist in the Constantinople Museum and in that of Philadelphia have reopened a world of history and even of literature. On a few occasions I was consulted by Hilprecht as to the classification of some of the documents which he had deciphered. When he had to deal with the later periods of Assyrian history the inscriptions are as easy to be read by those acquainted with cuneiform script and language as if they were in modern print ; and it is tempting to speak of some of the results which these discoveries have already revealed to the world.

In the early period of my residence I met poor George Smith, the genius who astonished the world by his reproduction of tablets which were presumably in the hands of the compiler of the Mosaic cosmogony. He stayed with me on his first voyage to Mossul, and on his starting upon the second. In the autumn of 1876 I travelled with Mrs. Skene, the wife of the British Consul at Aleppo, at whose house Smith—worn out by an overland journey from Bagdad which in his enfeebled health he ought not to have taken—died.

The discovery of Hittite civilisation brought me the friendship of all the English explorers who are connected with that achievement : Mr. Hogarth, whose valuable work in many fields is well known, and who, notwithstanding the war, will, I trust, be able to clear up the various questions connected with Carchemish, the southern capital of the Hittites ; Mr. John Garstang, who has already achieved good results at Sakje-Guje, though neither he nor Mr. Hogarth, nor the German Herr Otto Wynchler at Boghazkewi, the northern capital, have yet succeeded in finding a bilingual. Nor in connection with Hittite discovery must the labours of Professor Sayce be forgotten. Sir William Ramsay and his wife we have often had the pleasure of meeting, and it is probably fully thirty years ago, when at Smyrna, that the late Mr. Humann, the explorer of Pergamum, told me that though

he was proud of what he had done in that place and of what the Austrians had accomplished at Ephesus, yet that Ramsay, without Government aid, had done better than all.

At one time it looked as if England were dropping behind in archæological research in Asia Minor and Syria, but the Ramsays and the men whose names I have already mentioned, and Miss Gertrude Lothian Bell, together with Lord Kitchener, Gordon, Macalister, Sir Charles Wilson, Sir Charles Watson, and the other distinguished men who have worked at the exploration of Palestine, have removed that reproach.

In reference to Constantinople itself, my own interest and studies of its history have brought me the friendship, or at least the acquaintance, of a number of distinguished scholars. Probably the man who knows most of the archæology of the city is my friend Dr. Alexander van Millingen, whose two volumes—one of the Walls of Constantinople and the other on its Ancient Christian Churches, will remain the standard books on the subject as long as people are interested in the history of our great city.

It is not too much to say that of the many distinguished scholars who have found their way to Constantinople during the last forty years and who have been interested in at least some portion of its history, all, or nearly all, have found their way to our house. It has been the pride and joy of my wife, as it has been my own, to meet such men and to show them what kindness we could. Sir William Ramsay has spoken of it as a house of call for archæologists.

I have mentioned incidentally the visit I received from Dean Armitage Robinson. The learned Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury accompanied me round the Walls and took an archæologist's interest in several matters. The Bishop of Peterborough and Lady Mary Glyn, whose kindness I shall always remember, made the same pleasant trip. But the ecclesiastic who took the most interest in these outings was Bishop Collins. The numerous notices that appeared in England upon his premature death permitted me to understand how highly he was valued by the

best men in the Church. If time and space would permit, I could tell several interesting stories about him, the general effect of which would be to show that he was a man of singularly wide reading in early Church history and of excellent judgment, especially in reference to the work accomplished and still being done in the Eastern Churches. He was a great man as well as a great Churchman, and his loss was a very serious one to the whole of the British communities between Gibraltar and Batum. Or again I should like to tell of a delightful, short visit with Dr. Spooner, Warden of New College, Oxford, to the late patriarch Joachim and afterwards to the grand old man of the Eastern Church, Bishop Briennios of Ismidt, the discoverer of the Didaki, the Teaching of the Apostles. I should like also to speak of my very dear friends Canon and Mrs. Shoobridge, from Tasmania, and of our visit together to my old friend the Armenian patriarch Ourmanian, and of a number of others. That journey indeed round the walls of our city recalls pleasant times when accompanied by Mr. Shaw Lefevre, now Lord Eversley, Mr. Frederic Harrison, or by others, among whom I must not forget J. B. Bury, Regius Professor of History at Cambridge, a scholar who by his notes to Gibbon, as well as by his other historical studies, has placed himself in the first rank of historians. My friendship of nearly half a century ago recalls three long visits from Rev. Brooke Lambert.

I had many visits from German and French Professors of History and other interesting persons great in their own sphere. The fact that in a lecture I had given I had shown my appreciation of his writings possibly did something to bring about a delightful visit from Mr. and Mrs. James Russell Lowell. At a later period Mr. Choate, then American Ambassador to London, came to Constantinople. I had met him at dinner at the British Embassy, and the fact that years before I had reviewed the *Life of Mr. Rufus Choate* (I think an uncle) perhaps induced him to tell me more good stories of that distinguished American lawyer. The visit of Mr. Choate led to an incident which has its amusing side.

We had arranged to go round Stambul and see some of the less known objects of interest. It was at a time when espionage was at its worst, and I had the honour always to be upon the Black List of Abdul Hamid's press department. Our carriage was to start from the British Embassy and pick me up at our own house. Now that house was, and is, immediately opposite what may be called the Town Hall. The Sultan, wishing to show respect to the American Ambassador to Great Britain, arranged to send one of the somewhat gorgeous palace carriages to be at his disposal. Accordingly, after an early lunch a palace carriage containing the Ambassador and two ladies—I think Mrs. and Miss Choate—drew up before my door. The Ambassador came upstairs for two or three minutes, and it was arranged, as usual, that the party should return to tea.

We accomplished our expedition very satisfactorily, and in returning again stopped at the house. The windows of the Town Hall were crowded with faces to see the palace carriage, and we were amused for days to hear the conjectures as to the explanation of the carriage being before our door.

I should like to have added reminiscences of the many visits I have made into the interior of Asia Minor, notably of one in 1913 with Mr. Frew to Konia, the ancient Iconium ; to Jerusalem, whose unique history as the sacred city of the three great monotheistic religions must always hold the highest place ; to Baalbek, whose colossal ruins drill into the visitor's mind the fact that the great temples of the world, like probably many churches in England, were built rather to the honour and glory of the god than to serve the ordinary purposes of worship. Laodacia, Pergamum, Patmos and Rhodes, Chios and Cyprus, all recall visits full of interest, but especially Hierapolis. Fancy a larger Harrogate or Bath absolutely deserted except for a few Euruks, or gypsies. Its two theatres, one of which would seat probably 20,000 people and the other 15,000, its ruined temples, churches, baths all deserted ; but the stream of hot water, which once made the prosperity of the city and caused it to be frequented

in Roman and Byzantine times, still wells up and runs through the streets in channels which it has largely worn for itself, until the volume of warm water falls over a cliff, making a series of precipices resembling, though on a much smaller scale, the famous terraces of New Zealand. I visited it with my friends Mr. and Mrs. Bliss, whose home, first at Sochia and afterwards at Boujah, in the suburbs of Smyrna was always a model of family life.

But though all these places and a score of others which I have visited are interesting, yet, in certain respects, the most impressive of all is Ephesus. To sit in its great theatre and read the chapter of the Acts of the Apostle giving account of the riot created by the worshippers of Diana, brings the scene in the most vivid manner before one. Seated in the gallery, with the once busy Bay of Ephesus, now a dried-up marsh, before us, with the ruins of many buildings connected by history or legend with the Early Church and Byzantine history is amongst the most vivid experiences I have ever had.

My recollection of visitors and friends in Constantinople recalls the inevitable result that a large number of them have joined the majority. It is impossible that one should have lived forty-two years in a city like Constantinople, of many nationalities, without forming attachments that are very dear. The British families, some of which have been settled in Turkey and who constitute colonies which by virtue of the Capitulations have preserved to each member his national character, are communities of which England may well be proud. At the outbreak of the present war thirty-three men in Constantinople, nearly all of good families, volunteered to fight for their King. I should think that fully half of them have now acquired commissions. Some bright young fellows with promising careers have become victims of the war. George V. has no more loyal subjects than the Englishmen settled in Constantinople and other places in the Turkish empire. I am proud of them.

In concluding these reminiscences of my sojourn in Turkey I may be excused if I venture to suggest considerations

which in my opinion will have to be taken into account in forming an opinion as to the future of Constantinople and the various races now under Turkish rule. Perhaps the first question which arises in the mind of the reader is whether Turkey can again become an empire entitled to rank among the Great Powers. In answering it, the future of Constantinople becomes a highly important factor. Its destiny may be (1) to remain in the hands of the Turks under the masterful rule of the Germans ; or (2) to pass into the occupation of Russia ; or (3) to become the capital of a small internationalised State surrounding the Marmara, the Bosphorus, and the Dardanelles.

A fourth probability may be suggested, namely, that it should be left as now to the Turks. This would imply not only that the Allies should be entirely defeated, but that Germany and Austria should also be so weakened that they would not be able to impose their will on Turkey. To anticipate such a conclusion of the war is to pass out of the region of practical politics. Turkey has linked her fate in the war with that of Germany and her ally. If they should win, Turkey will become a State subject to Germany. I have held the opinion for many years that Germany has chosen the Turkish empire as her " place in the sun," and that she has steadily worked with the object of bringing Turkey under her rule. I have even believed in the probability of a partition of Turkey with the consent of Great Britain and France, if her rulers did not shew themselves capable of reconciling the Armenian, Greek, and Arab populations. If the present war had not intervened it appeared to me probable (1) that Russia, with an Armenian population almost if not quite as large as that in Turkey, could no more tolerate the misgovernment and outrages in neighbouring Armenia than she had been able to tolerate that in any of the Balkan States ; (2) that in the general European abhorrence of such misgovernment and political annoyance occasioned thereby, every Power in Europe would have been willing to permit or even invite Russia to enter Asia Minor and annex a strip of country through Armenia proper

and Little Armenia, as far as and including Alexandretta ; that Germany in compensation would have been allowed to exercise an overlordship over Constantinople and the remainder of Asia Minor ; and (3) that special international arrangements would be made for Palestine, Syria, and Arabia. Many facts pointed to such a solution. I had even arrived at the conclusion that the British Government had given in its adhesion generally to a solution on these lines. It would have been compatible with such plan that the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus should be dismantled and that Russia should have—as she ought to have—as free right of passage through both straits as all nations have through those of Dover. The evidence that Great Britain acquiesced generally in such solution appeared to me, as far back as 1906, and still appears to me, abundant.

The events, however, of the last six or seven years have convinced me that Germany contemplated a much wider scheme. She apparently aimed at a grandiose project by which she and Austria would annex Serbia, force a way to Salonica and employ that city and its magnificent harbour as a basis of operations against Turkey, which she proposed to annex or to convert into a tributary state. I have in various places mentioned facts which support my opinion of this scheme, and need not here repeat them. Her unstinted support of Abdul Hamid, her cruel abstention from protesting against outrages on the Armenians even in Constantinople itself, her lavish expenditure of money in order to obtain support for her railway and other useful projects, the Kaiser's bid for the leadership of the Moslem world, the readiness with which Germany furnished soldiers for the training of the Turkish army, the unwillingness which she and Austria shewed to join the other Powers in attempting to secure protection for life and property in Macedonia, all point to a design by which not only was Germany to obtain a dominant influence over Turkey, but should be placed in a position to do what she liked in Asia Minor. When we reached the eve of the present war Germany had already laid her plans for forcing Turkey to take part in it on her side.

The Turks naturally would be opposed to such a solution. It would mean for them the end of Turkey as an independent state. The Young Turkey Party who were in office in August, 1914, and are still there, determined to remain neutral. The evidence in the White Paper, "Events leading to the Rupture with Turkey," published in November, 1914, shews that the Turkish Ministers were all but unanimous in their endeavour to maintain neutrality.

They were, however, rushed into war, and the position is therefore changed, and the present question appears to be: Will Turkey be allowed to retain Constantinople? Of course I do not know what arrangements actually exist among the Entente Powers, and therefore must discuss the question as if no arrangement regarding the disposal of Constantinople in the event of their complete success exists. On the one hand, objections to the city being delivered to Russia are the following: Constantinople would be a Russian port detached from the empire and inaccessible under present conditions except by the Black Sea, which, during the winter months, still retains its evil reputation. If Russia possessed it and wished to have land transit she could only obtain it by crushing Rumania and Bulgaria. To do so would be a difficult task in comparison with which the annexation of Finland would be comparatively easy. Russia at the present time has the gratitude of every Balkan State. To them she is the Deliverer, and the strongest arguments that have been used in Rumania and Bulgaria to prevent these States joining the Entente Powers is that they would be endangering their own future by allowing Russia to obtain possession of Constantinople. I need not repeat what three Czars of Russia, looking at the matter with the eyes of statesmen, have said against the permanent occupation of the city. By such occupation she would lose her prestige in the Balkans as shown in the glorious epithet she has obtained as their Deliverer and Protector, and make permanent enemies of the flourishing Balkan States. Moreover, for reasons which I have set out elsewhere, I believe that Constantinople can never acquire the world importance which she once

possessed. To own a second-rate seaport isolated from the rest of the empire would bring the great Eastern empire neither profit nor renown. On the other hand there undoubtedly exists in Russia a feeling that one of the great objects of the war is the acquisition of Constantinople. As already mentioned, Skobelev stated a generation ago, "Every Russian is born with the belief that it is the destiny of his country to possess it." When I put forward the suggestion that the city should be neutralised it was met by a storm of opposition by the popular journals of Russia. Should success in the war place it at the disposal of the Entente, it is to be hoped that its fate will be decided so far as Russia is concerned by the statesmen of that country, and not by ignorant popular clamour.

In order to find an answer to the question: Can Turkey again become a State entitled to rank among the European Powers? many considerations have to be remembered, of which the following are the most important. Since 1683, when Turkey's progress as a nation received its first check, she has been steadily declining. From 1453, when Mahomet II. captured Constantinople, up to that date, the Ottoman Turks had been as steadily advancing. In 1683 they were besieging Vienna, and the city was relieved by John Sobieski, King of Poland. Every quarter of a century since that date has seen the loss of some portion of Turkish territory. In 1683 she exercised lordship over all Hungary and part of Austria; over all Rumania and every inch of the Balkan peninsula; over every country in North Africa from the Red Sea to the Atlantic; over the Caucasus and a part of Persia, over Crete, Cyprus, and all the islands of the Aegean.

With insignificant exceptions Turkey has never regained territory which she has once lost. The exceptions to which I allude are not numerous, but I call them insignificant because the territory regained by Turkey has soon been recovered by the rival state. Not to do more than mention that in the south of Russia the Crimea and adjacent lands changed hands, but are now definitely Moscovite, I may take an illustration within the memory of most readers.

Greece in 1897 lost and Turkey gained small strips of territory in Thessaly and Epirus. In 1912 Greece regained and Turkey lost not only these strips but great additional territory.


The Moslem population of Asia Minor is steadily decreasing. For facts relating to this decrease I refer my readers to my volume published in 1911, *Turkey and its People*. The Turks properly so-called were nomads whose habitat was south central Asia. Until the Crimean war of 1853-6 there was a constant though constantly diminishing stream of Turkish immigrants trickling into Asia Minor and strengthening the Moslem element. Russia's occupation of the Caucasus and Georgia and Russian administration have dammed this supply. The Turks in their original home were probably, like other nomads, the gypsies for instance in England, never prolific. Nor does polygamy tend to change the situation; for though that practice and concubinage are lawful, the testimony of many writers who have lived in Turkey, including notably some English ladies, shows that with occasional exceptions Moslem families in Turkey are comparatively small.

The modern Turk has lost the barbaric delight in fighting. The Moslem fights well when under discipline, especially European, as witness the conduct of the Zouaves under France and of Moslem troops in India. But he has not, as his ancestors had, a passionate desire for war for war's sake. Even in this present year, 1915, Turkish regiments in Syria and in Smyrna refused to be sent to the front, as their predecessors had refused to be sent to Arabia. My explanation is that the Turks have so intermarried with Christians as to have lost the ancient delight in battle. A British consul tells the story of his being present less than ten years ago in Trebizond, when a friendly question arose in the Governor's house among several notables as to how far those present and other Moslem dignitaries of the neighbourhood were Turkish in blood. One of them, an influential man, boldly said, "None of us are. You all know that when our fathers or grandfathers wanted a wife they looked out for

the prettiest Armenian or Greek girl and simply took her. How can we be pure Turks in blood ? ”

The present war, whatever its result, will still further weaken Turkey. The Allies will either defeat Turkey or be beaten by her. If they win, most of the provinces in Eastern Asia Minor will come under Russian rule. If they lose, the Armenians will become a more disturbing element to Turkey than they have ever yet been, for during the war they have not only been foolishly persecuted where they should have been cherished, and have lost all hope of living in harmony with their Moslem masters, but they have gained the hope that they will soon be under Christian, though Russian, rule.

From these indications I conclude that it is highly improbable that Turkey can ever again be considered as one of the Great Powers. Nevertheless, the fact must not be lost sight of that there are probably seven millions of Moslems who still claim to be Osmanlis. They have a right to exist as a nation, and a huge political blunder will be committed if they are not dealt with justly. As to what territory should be left to them, that is a question for statesmen. Neither with that question nor with what I consider to be the best solution in reference to the occupation of Constantinople, do I deal here. My suggestions on these subjects are before the public and hardly come within my reminiscences. One point, however, I urge very strongly. The Turk should be treated with justice and generosity. He has failed lamentably as a ruler of subject races. Europe should show him a more just, humane, and generous spirit.



INDEX

- ABDUL AZIZ**, Sultan of Turkey, 5,
 14, 27, 52-55, 102, 106, 143, 170,
 291, 292
Abdul Hamid, Sultan of Turkey,
 23, 55-58, 77-87, 92, 95, 103-120,
 134, 138-143, 145, 148-150, 153,
 155-161, 165-176, 181, 184, 195,
 196, 201-203, 206-208, 213-215,
 218, 220-239, 241-248, 253, 257,
 259, 261-264, 268, 283-297, 301,
 302, 308, 318, 324, 331, 355,
 366, 372
Abdul Houda, Court Astrologer,
 234, 235, 241
Abdul Medjid, Sultan of Turkey,
 55, 95, 289
Abdul Mejuel, 71, 74
Adana, 298, 299
Aden, 344
Adrianople, 60, 213, 225, 230, 234,
 255, 278, 331-333, 339, 342, 348
Aegean Islands, 332
Afghanistan, 134
Agha Khan, 351
Ahmed Riza Bey, 224, 260, 266,
 272, 274
Ahmed Vefyk, 58, 60
Aidin, 60, 348
Akaba, 113
Alabama Case, 40
Albania, 254-256, 307
Alessio, 326
Alexander II., Czar of Russia, 5, 24,
 25, 27, 35
Alexander III., Czar of Russia, 193,
 326, 327, 333, 334, 340
Alexandria, 2, 37, 88, 89, 121
Algiers, 293
Ali Suavi, 108
Alischan (Dragoman), 49
Alison, Mr. (Secretary of Embassy),
 46
Allaverdi, family of, 177
Ameer Ali, 336
American sympathies in Russo-
Turkish war, 28, 29
Anatolia, 251, 302
Anna Comnena, 240
Antivari, 83, 93
Arabi Pasha, 87-89
Argyll, Duke of, 16, 45
Armenia, 60, 63, 76, 149-169, 201,
 226-229, 241, 344, 356, 366
Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., 171,
 172
Arnold, Dr. Thomas, 14
Arnold, Matthew, 3
Astrologers, 112, 113
Athens, 66, 69, 70, 199, 209, 275,
 342, 360
Atkin, Edward, 366
Austria, 31, 33, 146, 223, 254, 255,
 322, 323, 327, 334, 341, 348, 374,
 375
Ayasaluk, 147
Ayton, Mr., M.P., 101

BAALBECK, 372
Bagdad, 294, 369
Bagdad Railway, 112
Baker, Colonel Valentine (Baker
 Pasha), 32-34, 91-94, 126, 166
Balata, 176
Balkan Wars (1912 and 1913), 323-
 338
Barclay, Sir George, 317
Baring, Walter, 20, 27, 60
Barker, Mr., of the Bible Society
 (Bible Barker), 9-11
Barrère, M., 36
Bartlett, E., Ashmead, 335
Batak, 19, 161
Bath, Marquis of, 45
Batoum, 110, 269, 371
Beaumont, Mr. (Embassy Coun-
 sellor), 334, 335, 347
Bebek, 15
Bedri Bey, 357, 358, 365

- Begler Bay, Palace of, 103
 Belgrade, 136
 Bell, Miss Gertrude Lothian, 370
 Bennett, Gordon, 158, 159
 Bent, Theodore, 70
 Bérard, Victor, 200
 Berlin, 81, 83, 148, 149, 152, 194, 201, 342
 Beshiskdash, 269, 288
 Besika Bay, 14, 27, 66
 Beyrout, 72, 304, 319
 Birajek, 160
 Bismarck, Prince, 31, 81, 82
 Bistani Effendi, 303, 304, 341, 348
Blackwood's Magazine, 225, 260, 280, 281
 Bliss, Mr. and Mrs., 373
 Block, Lady, 336
 Block, Sir Adam, 346, 347
 Blunt, General, 166
 Boghazkewi, 369
 Bokhara, 126
 Bosnia, 14, 31, 322, 323
Breslau, 341-343, 349, 352
 Brett, Mr. Justice, 2
 Briennios (Bishop of Ismidt), 371
 Brougham, Lord, 3
 Brown, Rev. Mr., 186-188
 Brusa, 105, 208
 Brussels, 126, 127
 Bucharest, 15, 46, 136, 333, 339
 Buda-Pesth, 127-130, 272
 Bulgaria, 13-24, 27, 29, 38, 39, 45, 52, 57, 59-61, 81-83, 107, 110, 151, 161, 189, 191-201, 221, 323, 325-329, 331-334, 339, 340, 342, 355, 356, 360, 366
 Bulwer, Sir Henry, 124, 125
 Burgas, 194
 Burgess, Miss, 163, 164, 336
 Burnabashi, 65
 Bury, Professor J. B., 366, 371
 Butt, Sir Charles P., 2, 3
 Buxton, Noel, 308
 Byron, Lord, 94, 151

 CAIRO, 88-90
 Calcutta, 186, 188
 Calice, Baron, 118, 146
 Calneh, 368
 Calvert, Mr., 65, 66
 Cambridge, 277
 Canning, Lady, *see* Stratford de Redcliffe, Lady
 Canning, Stratford, *see* Stratford de Redcliffe, Lord
 Canrobert, General, 48
 Carasso, Mr., 56, 258, 285, 286
 Caratheodori, Alexander Pasha, 79, 82
 Carchemish, 369
 Carnarvon, Lord, 3
 Carpenter, Miss Mary, 3
 Cassel, Sir Ernest, 305
 Cavalla, 148, 334, 340, 350
 Ceylon, 89
 Chambers, Dr., 298
 Chanak, 352
 Charters, Miss, 96, 365
 Chatalja, 327, 328, 342
 Cheragan, Palace of, 102, 170, 287
 Chevalier, M., 37
 Chichly, 363, 365
 Chios, 62, 65, 167, 290, 350, 372
 Choate, J. H., 371, 372
 Cilicia, 60, 298, 299, 302, 309
 Clark, Sir Campbell, 36
 Clemow, Dr., 279
 Collins, Bishop, 371
 Cologne, 125
 Committee of Union and Progress, 203, 204, 223-225, 228-230, 235, 241, 242, 244-246, 251, 253-255, 258-261, 266-276, 284, 292, 293, 297-321, 325
 Constanza, 340, 343
Contemporary Review, 308, 309, 321, 331, 351
 Corruption of Turkish Government, 5
 Corti, Count, 40
 Cox, Mr. Sunset, 135, 136
 Cramps, Messrs., 171, 172
 Crawford, Sir Richard, 320
 Crawshay, George, 6-8
 Crete, 332, 347, 352
 Crimea, 8, 9, 32
 Critobolus, 128, 130
 Crofton, Sir Walter, 3
 Cumaroff, Colonel, 84, 85
 Currie, Lady, 174, 179-181, 183
 Currie, Sir Philip W., 149, 153, 154, 165, 166, 173, 174, 178, 180, 181, 183, 189, 219, 235, 346
 Curtis, Canon, 179
 Cyprus, 372
 Cyzicus, 209

Daily News, The, 12, 16-18, 20, 21, 24, 58, 107, 116, 117, 127, 142, 158, 181, 366
Daily Telegraph, The, 20, 36, 157

- Damascus, 71, 72, 74, 113, 178
 Damat Ferid Pasha, 309, 337
 Dardanelles, The, 5, 27, 66, 171, 342, 350, 375
 Dédéagatch, 334, 350, 359, 363
 Derby, Lord, 3
 Derwent, 34, 199
 Dethier, Dr., 128, 129
 Devonshire, Duke of, 332
 Dickson, Dr., 54, 55, 106
 Digby, Honourable Mrs., 71-74
 Dilber Effendi, 355
 Disraeli, B., afterwards Lord Beaconsfield, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 75, 76, 81
 Dodd, Miss, 71
 Dogs of Constantinople, 310-312
 Dolma Bagshe, Palace of, 102, 103, 170, 288
 Dörpfeld, Dr., 66
 Dufferin, Lady, 91, 94, 97, 98, 335
 Dufferin, Lord, 87, 88, 90-95, 97-99, 108, 134, 138, 330
 Dufferin, Lord, *Letters from High Latitudes*, 98
 Dulcigno, 83
 Durazzo, 326

 EASTER cakes, 68, 69
 Easter celebration in the Holy Orthodox Church, 63, 64, 67
Eastern Express, 115
 Eastern Roumelia, 81, 254
 Edhem Pasha, 68
 Edward VII., 3, 69, 104, 126, 238, 367
 Egerton, Sir Edwin, 70
 Egypt, 77-80, 87-94, 108-115, 132, 213-215, 226, 320, 348, 351, 360, 362
 Egypt, Khedive of, *see* Ismail, and Tewfik
 El Arish, 113
 Ellenborough, Lord, 71
 Elliot, Sir Francis, 360
 Elliot, Sir Henry, 16, 20, 21, 23, 43-45, 57, 60, 61, 75, 106-108, 152, 292, 360
 England, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 40, 52, 53, 56, 60, 61, 78-81, 83, 84, 88-94, 105, 107-110, 114, 132, 155, 161, 167, 191, 195, 198, 213-215, 219, 223, 235, 239-241, 244, 254, 299, 303-306, 324, 329, 330, 336, 341, 343, 345, 347-351, 353
English Historical Review, 179
 Enos, 331, 332, 340
 Enver Pasha, 229, 230, 282, 300, 331, 332, 339, 341, 342, 348, 353, 355-357, 365
 Ephesus, 69, 370
 Erzeroum, 212, 227, 347
 Erzinghian, 268
 Essad Pasha, 56, 285, 286
 Euxine, The, 34
 Evans, Sir Arthur, 177
 Eversley, Lord, 366, 371
 Eyres, Mr. (Consul-General), 280
 Eyub (Standard Bearer to the Prophet), 175

 FANE, Sir E., 149
 Fehim Effendi, 206-208
 Ferdinand I., Czar of Bulgaria, 189, 191, 192, 323, 333
 Ferid Pasha, 112, 230, 231, 235, 256, 302, 316, 336
 Fersovitch, 254, 255
 Fetva Eminé, The, 232, 233
 Field, Edwin, 98-100
 Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund, 28
 Fitzmaurice, G., 138, 160, 161, 263, 344-346
 Florina, 200
 Ford, Sir F. C., 148
 Forster, W. E., 16, 45, 46, 217
 Foster, Morgan, 44, 53, 96, 125
 France, 53, 58, 78-80, 88-94, 109, 110, 161, 167-169, 171, 195, 198, 202, 214, 223, 303, 341, 347, 352, 353
 Francis, Sir Philip, 50, 51
Frankfurter Zeitung, 37
 Frew, Rev. Robert, 164, 335, 337, 364, 372
 Fry, Miss Isabel, 320
 Fuller, Sir Bampfylde, 302

 GABRIEL Effendi Nouradunghian, 244
 Galata, 47, 50, 142, 162, 163, 202, 236, 252, 260, 264, 266, 276, 288, 341, 358, 363
 Galenga, Mr., *Times* Correspondent, 16, 21, 36, 37, 44
 Galib Bey, 255, 286
 Gamble, Admiral, 173, 324
 Gardiner, Miss Alice, 277, 278, 280
 Gardner, A. G., 366
 Garstang, John, 369
 Gates, Dr., 13
 Gaulis, M., 200
 Geneva, 201

Genoa, 171, 172
 George V., 373
 Germany, 111, 112, 137, 169, 223,
 261, 324, 340-345, 348-356, 361,
 364, 374
 Ghazi Mukhtar, 215
 Gibbon, E., 128
 Gibraltar, 371
 Gibseh, 212, 213
 Girls' English High School, 94-96,
 148, 180, 282, 365
 Gladstone, W. E., 3, 13, 18-21, 45,
 61, 76, 77, 84, 90, 92, 99, 108,
 109, 151, 214
 Gladstone, W. E., *Bulgarian Horrors*
and the Questions of the East, 20
 Glyn, Lady Mary, 370
 Goeben, 341-343, 348, 349, 352
 Golem, 326
 Goltz, von der, Pasha, 247
 Goschen, George J., 81-87, 93, 138,
 139, 201
 Gourko, General, 25, 26, 29, 32
 Graves, Robert W., 346
 Greece, 82, 83, 171, 194-197, 327-
 329, 332-334, 339, 348, 350
 Greene, Miss, 96
 Gregory the Illuminator, 149
 Grey, Sir Edward, 304, 364
 Griscom, Mr., 172
 Gueschoff, Mr., 13, 14, 333

HAAG, Karl, 71, 72
 Habib Melhame, 242
 Hadji Adil Bey, 325
 Haji Ali, 141, 142
 Hakki Pasha, 230, 306, 307, 309,
 355
 Halim Pasha, 78-80, 146
 Hallil Bey, 347
 Halim, Prince, 355
 Hamdi Bey, 66, 68, 176, 212, 320
 Hanley, Baron, 192
 Harrison, Frederic, 3, 366, 371
 Hasluck, Mr., 209
 Hassan Fehmi, 274, 275
 Hasskewi, 44, 45, 49, 50
 Hedjaz Railway, 113
 Hepworth, Mr., of *New York Herald*,
 159
 Hepworth, *Through Armenia on*
Horseback, 159, 160
 Heraclia, 210, 211
 Herbert, Michael, afterwards Sir,
 165
 Herzegovina, 14, 31, 322, 323
 Hicks Pasha, 94

Hierapolis, 69, 372
 Hill, Frank, 12
 Hill, Frederic, 2, 3
 Hill, Matthew Davenport, 2
 Hill, Sir Rowland, 2
 Hilmi Pasha, 196, 235, 268, 307
 Hilprecht, Professor, 369
 Hissarlik, 62, 65, 66
 Hobart Pasha, 85, 148
 Hogarth, Mr., 177, 369
 Hornby, Admiral, 29, 30
 Hughes, Mr. (Secretary of Em-
 bassy), 46
 Hughes, Rev. Dr. *Dictionary of*
Islam, 293, 294
 Hughes, Thomas, 28
 Humann, 369
 Hunter, Professor W. A., 17
 Hyacinthe, Père, 121, 122

ICONIUM, 175
 Ignatiev, General, 22, 28, 57, 145
Illustrated London News, 36, 37
 Irene, Empress, 70
 Ismail, Khedive of Egypt, 77-80,
 87, 124, 125, 146, 214, 215, 291
 Ismail Pasha (head of Artillery
 Department), 241
 Ismailia, 89
 Ismidt, 85, 168
 Italy, 110, 171, 172, 323, 324,
 326, 332
 Izzedin, 352
 Izzet Pasha, 111-113, 241

JAHID, 266
 Javad Bey, 304-307
 Jemal Bey, 341, 247, 353
 Jemal-eddin, *see* Sheik-ul-Islam
 Jerusalem, 58
 Jevad Bey, 258
 Joachim, Patriarch, 150, 371
 Jonescu, Takè, 330
 Joseph, Monsignor, 198

KADIKEWI, 123, 162, 362
 Kaula, Baron, 322
 Khiva, 126
 Kiamil Pasha, 235, 244, 263, 268,
 269, 272, 307, 331, 332
 Kinglake, A. W., *Eothen*, 197
 Kingsley, Rev. Charles, 3
 Kirk Kilissé, 327
 Kitchener, Lord, 330, 370
 Knight, Professor W. A., 319
 Konia, 112, 175, 231, 372
 Kossova, 254, 255

Kotchana, 325
 Kum Kali, 66
 Kum Kapou, 186, 251
 Kumanova, 326
 Kustenji, *see* Constanza
 Kutchuk Saïd, *see* Said Pasha

LABOUCHERE, H. D., 17, 46, 306
 Lamb, Mr. (Consul-General at
 Salonica), 346
 Lambert, Rev. Brooke, 371
Lancet, The, 55
 Laodacia, 69, 372
 Law Courts, Building of, 99-101
Law Magazine, 1, 50, 51, 101
 Layard, Lady, 80
 Layard, Mr., afterwards Sir Henry,
 6, 21, 45, 75-77, 80, 81, 88, 96,
 105, 108, 114, 152, 166
 Leishman, Mr. (American Am-
 bassador), 302
 Levant Company, The, 240
Levant Herald, 115, 351
 Liman von Sandars, General, 348
 Limpus, Admiral, 173, 325, 352,
 360, 361
 Liverpool, 176
 London, 79, 84, 99-101, 126, 142,
 147, 176, 328, 329, 332, 344, 361,
 366
 Long, Dr. Albert, 13, 15-17, 59, 70,
 94, 192
 Loti, Pierre, *Les Disenchantees*, 320
 Lowell, Mr. and Mrs. James Russell,
 371
 Lowther, Lady, 265, 336, 338
 Lowther, Sir Gerard A., 238, 241,
 265, 302, 309
 Lucerne, 80
 Lyons, Lord, 125

MACEDONIA, 194-196, 198-201, 223,
 225-232, 239, 241, 251, 254-256,
 308, 319, 322, 326, 327, 331, 334,
 339
 Macgahan, J. A., 18-20, 24
 Macgahan, J. A., *Northern Lights*,
 24
 McLean, Dr., 277
 Macpherson, General, 92
 Macrikewi, 163
 Madrid, 21, 45, 75
 Mahdi, The, *see* Mahomet Achmed
 Mahmud, 88
 Mahmud Damat, 202
 Mahmud Mukhtar, 260-264, 266,
 275

Mahomet II., 128, 129, 175, 293
 Mahomet V., Sultan of Turkey, 56,
 105, 175, 287-289, 291, 302, 307,
 331
 Mahomet Achmed (the Madi), 93,
 110
 Malet, Sir Edward, 122
 Mallet, Sir Louis, 333, 344-347, 349
 Malta, 31, 173, 325, 360, 361
 Manning, Rev. H. E., afterwards
 Cardinal, 3
 Marschall von Bieberstein, Baron,
 169, 205-208, 216, 217, 305, 329,
 330
 Marschall von Bieberstein, Baron-
 ess, 329
 Marseilles, 202, 361
 Marsovan, 340
 Maurice, Rev. F. D., 3
 Maynard, Mr. (American Minister),
 60
 Mecca, 111, 293
 Media, 331, 332, 340
 Medina, 111
 Mehmet Ali, Khedive of Egypt, 78
 Midhat Pasha, 14, 55-57, 103, 107,
 223, 235, 237, 243, 291, 292
 Military League, The, 325
 Mill, John Stuart, 3
 Mirsky, Prince, 26
 Missionaries, 9-11, 28, 85, 150, 151,
 154, 163, 164, 186, 193, 194
 Mitylene, 250
 Mizzi, Dr. L. F., 367
 Moda, 261-264
 Monastir, 200, 229, 230, 233, 234,
 325, 326
 Montenegro, 57, 82, 83, 326
 Moore, Mr., 278
 Morgenthau, Mr., American Am-
 bassador, 133, 341, 356-359, 361-
 365
 Morgenthau, Mrs., 359, 361-365
 Morley, Lord, 330
 Morocco, 293
 Mukhtar Pasha, Ghazi, 25, 110,
 261, 325, 329, 332
 Müller, Karl, 128
 Munir Pasha, 79
 Munich, 205
 Murad I., 308
 Murad V., Sultan of Turkey, 14, 55,
 56, 103, 105, 170, 286
 Mustafa Fazil Pasha, 146

NADIR AGHA, 302
 Napoleon III., 58

Nazim Bey, 229, 230
 Nazim, Dr., 203
 Nazim Pasha, 261, 263, 268, 269, 331, 332
 Neochorion, 66
Neue Freie Presse, 232
 Newspaper Correspondents, 12, 16-21, 36-39
 Newspapers in Turkey, 115-119
 New York, 368
New York Herald, The, 24, 158, 159
 Niazi Bey, 229, 230
 Nicaea, 63, 66, 67, 69-71
 Nicomedia, 168
 Nicopolis, 25
 Nightingale, Miss Florence, 3, 280
Nineteenth Century, 107
 Nineveh, 75, 152
 Nippur, 368
 Northcote, Lady Rosalind, 298
 Northcote, Sir Stafford, 3
 Norton, Mrs., 212
 OCHRIDA, 229, 326
 O'Connor, Lady, 164, 189-191, 215, 216
 O'Connor, Sir Nicholas, 114, 124, 164, 189-191, 195, 199, 202, 207-213, 215-217, 235, 315-317, 319
 Odessa, 15, 64, 97, 353
 O'Donovan, Mr., *Daily News Correspondent*, 127
 Oscan Effendi, 341, 348
 Osman Pasha, 25, 230
Osmanische Lloyd, The, 351
 Ortakewi, 311
 Ouchy, 323
 Ovey, Mr. (Embassy Secretary), 345
 Oxford, 177
 Oxyaea, 312
 PALATIUM, 176
 Palestine, 370
Pall Mall Gazette, 36
 Palmerston, Lord, 125, 152
 Pancaldi, 281
 Paris, 79, 80, 155, 176, 201-203, 205, 223-225, 254, 305
 Paspates, Dr., 62, 64, 368
 Passitch, Mr., 14, 333
 Patmos, 372
 Patterson, Dr., 94
 Pears, Sir Edwin, Secretary of the Social Science Association and of the International Prison Con-

gress; edits their *Transactions*; editor of the *Law Magazine*; writes for the *School Board Chronicle*; member of the North Eastern Circuit, 1; hears of a post in Constantinople, 2; obtains leave of absence, and proceeds to Constantinople, 3; resigns his post with the Social Service Association; his arrival at Constantinople, 4; he discovers the corruption of Turkish government, 5; his first letters to the *Daily News*, 12; he makes the acquaintance of Drs. Washburn and Long, 13; more letters to *Daily News*, 16-19; Mr. Gladstone's tribute to him, 20; his friendship with Macgahan, 24; on a visit to England, 30; confesses to misunderstanding the reason that Russia did not occupy Constantinople, 30, 31; his conversations with Skobelev, 33-35; his reminiscences of G. A. Sala, 36; a prize case in which he was engaged, 39-42; his lecture at the Hasskewi Institute, 49-51; denounced by many as an enemy of Turkey, 59; studies Turkish history, 60; present at Easter Celebration in the church, 63, 64; visits to Hissarlik, 66, and Nicaea, famous picture, 66, 71; attends the Easter celebrations there, 67; meets the Hon. Mrs. Digby, 72-74; meets Sir Henry Layard at Lucerne, 80; Lady Layard sends him Sir Henry's copy of Vassari, 81; his interest in the English High School for Girls, 94-97; the Dufferins centre of social life in Pera; amateur theatricals at British Embassy, 97, 98; the story of Edwin Field, 99-101; letters opened by the Turkish postal authorities, 107; exposes abuses in the *Daily News*, 116; threatened by censor, 117; meetings with Arminius Vambery, 124-130; his work on *The Destruction of the Greek Empire*, 128; he obtains a copy of Dr. Dethier's translation of Critobolus's *Life of Mahomet*, 128-130; assists in rescuing a girl

Pears, Sir Edwin, *continued*—

from being sold by her father, 130, 131; speaks at the "Commencement Day" at Robert College, 135, 136; Dr. Washburn's friendship with Sir William White, 136; is called to the palace by Abdul Hamid, 137, who offers him a decoration, 139, 140, which he refuses, 140-143; his remarks on Turkish tobacco, 145-148; his visit to an Armenian Church, 151; he publishes particulars of the Armenian outrages, 158; his last meeting with Said Pasha, 175, 176; his portrait by Hamdi Bey, 176; he meets Bishop Wordsworth, 178, 179; he is invited to dine with a spy, 181-183; refuses to defend a lady spy, 185, 186; present at Whit-Sunday service at Armenian Cathedral at Kum Kapou, 186-188; at Sofia meets Stambuloff, 189-191; and again at Philippopolis, 192-194; meets Baron Marschall von Bieberstein and travels two days with him, 205, 206; institutes proceedings against Fehim Effendi, 206-208; trips with Sir Nicholas O'Connor on the *Imogen*, 208-213; his experience of Turkish procrastination, 219, 220; what he saw of the demonstrations in the 1908 Revolution, 237, 238; he has an interview with the Sheik-ul-Islam, 249, 250; his experiences in the Counter Revolution of 1909, 265; he sees the ceremony of accession of Mahomet V., 287, 288; his impressions of Mahomet V., 289, his opinions on Moslem fanaticism, 292-295; sees some men who had been hanged, 303; his articles in *The Contemporary Review*, 308, 309, 321; archaeological discoveries in burnt parts of Constantinople, 314; what he was told by Sir Robert Rawlinson of the old drainage of the Selimieh barracks, 314; how he was able to prevent an unjust fire insurance law being passed, 315-317; with Professor Knight at Constantinople, 319; a conversation with Baron Marschall von

Bieberstein, 329, 330; delivers an address to the Eastern Questions Association, 330; his article in *The Contemporary Review*, 331; his activities in connection with the relief of the victims of the Balkan wars, 335-338; he delivers the "Commencement Address" at the American College, 340, 341; his opinions on the barrier between the Consular and Diplomatic Services, 345, 346; another contribution to *The Contemporary Review*, 351, 352; decides if possible to stay in Constantinople during the war, 354; the friendly attitude of the Turks towards him, 355; his expulsion urged by Baron von Wangenheim, 355; he is arrested and taken to the prison for non-Turkish subjects, 356; the American Ambassador is informed of his imprisonment and demands his release, 357; he is released, 358; he leaves Lady Pears in the care of Mr. and Mrs. Morgenthau and goes by rail across the Bulgarian frontier and to Dédéagatch, 359, and thence by a French steamer arrives at Malta and calls on Admiral Limpus, 360; proceeds via Marseilles to London, 361; a lunch is given in his honour by *Daily News* on the occasion of his being knighted, 366; elected President of the Prinkipo Yachting Club, 367; a dinner given by the Turkish and European Bars, 367; distinguished men whom he met during his residence in Constantinople, 368-373; considerations to be noted as to the future of Turkey, 374-379

Pears, Sir Edwin, *The Destruction of the Greek Empire*, 355

Pears, Sir Edwin, *The Fall of Constantinople, being the Story of the Fourth Crusade*, 65

Pears, Sir Edwin, *Turkey and its People*, 19, 160, 258, 298

Pearson, George C., 66, 68

Peet, Mr., 299

Pender, Sir John, 125

Pera, 4, 24, 84, 95, 96, 114, 142, 148, 162, 173, 180, 184, 206, 208,

Pera, *continued*—

236-238, 241, 262, 276-278, 281,
288, 313, 354, 358, 367

Pergamum, 369, 372

Peterborough, Bishop of, 370

Peters, Rev. John, 368

Philadelphia, 369

Philippopolis, 32, 60, 82, 192

Phillips, Hoffman, 335

Plevna, 25, 26, 32, 105

Porter, Sir James, 240

Poynter, Mrs. Hugh, 71

Prinkipo, 24, 27, 29, 33, 45, 46, 91,
136, 199, 209, 234, 241, 272, 355,
367

Prior, Melton, 36, 37

Pristina, 326

Prison Congress, International, 1, 3

*Prisons and Reformatories at Home
and Abroad*, 1

Proté, 264

RAFIA, 113

Raghib, 112

Ramsay, Sir William, 157, 177,
369, 370

Rawlinson, Sir Robert, 8, 314

Régie Ottomane de Tabac, 145-148

Reshad, Effendi, *see* Mahomet V.

Reval, 253, 254

Revue Diplomatique, La, 35

Rifaat Pasha, 268

Riza Tewfik, 303, 304, 308

Robert College, 13, 14, 59, 94, 95,
135, 192, 194, 340, 359

Robinson, Dean Armitage, 370

Robinson, Sir John, 17, 18, 107

Roe, Sir Thomas, 112, 113

Rosasco, Maître, 367

Rumania, 15, 110, 130, 136, 333,
334, 339, 340, 349, 376

Ruskin, John, 151

Russia, 18, 21, 22, 24, 31, 33, 35, 60,
61, 63, 105, 109, 132, 137, 155,

157, 158, 193, 198, 261, 300, 322,
327, 348, 349, 352, 374, 376, 377

Russia, British colony's feeling
against, 43-45, 59, 75

Russia, Czar of, *see* Alexander II.
and Alexander III.

Russian uniforms contrasted with
English, 30

Russo-Turkish war, 24-42, 295, 332

Rycaut, Paul, 240

SABA-EDDIN, *see* Sheik-ul-Islam

Sadyk, Colonel, 307

Sahib Mollah, *see* Sheik-ul-Islam

Said Halim, Prince, 80, 306, 333,
341, 347, 348, 352, 353, 355

Said Pasha (Kutchuk Said), 173-
176, 235, 242-244, 325

St. Petersburg, 87

Sakje-Guje, 369

Sala, George A., 36, 37

Salisbury, Marquis of, 22, 23, 36,
43, 57, 81, 109, 110, 149, 155, 214,
223

Salonica, 14, 58, 203, 223, 225, 229,
230, 232-235, 249, 255, 258, 259,
264, 275, 276, 280, 298, 307, 308,
319, 328, 334, 346, 350

Samarcand, 126

Samsoun, 340

San Stefano, 24, 27, 29, 31, 34, 81,
200, 275, 276, 283, 311, 312, 327,
335

Sandford, Bishop, 123

Sandison, Sir Alfred, 137-139, 142

Sayce, Professor, 369

Schliemann, Dr., 62, 65, 66, 368

Schneider, Carl, 37

School Board Chronicle, 1

Schuyler, Mr., 17-20, 27, 60, 189

Scoloudi, Mr., 332

Scott, Lady, 2

Scott, Sir John, 2

Scrkeji, 283, 288

Scudamore, F. I., 23

Scutari, 48, 71, 216, 263, 278, 280,
300, 307, 321, 332

Sebesti, The, 274

Selim I., Sultan of Turkey, 293

Serbia, 14, 57, 136, 201, 326-328,
339-341

Seymour, Admiral, 89

Sheik-ul-Islam, The, 237, 243,
244, 249, 250, 273, 285, 290-292,
348

Shemsi Pasha, 229-231

Shenova, 26, 27, 32

Shevket Pasha, 256, 264, 275, 276,
282, 283, 291, 300, 307, 325, 332,
333, 342

Shipka Pass, 25, 26, 32

Shishli, 281

Shoobridge, Canon and Mrs., 371

Silistria, 334, 340

Skene, Mrs., 369

Skobeleff, General, 24, 26, 27, 32-
35, 199

Slivnitsa, 213

"Smith, Captain," 37-39

Smith, Dr. George, 369

- Smyrna, 62, 84, 93, 167, 203, 212,
 232, 233, 235, 248, 290, 319, 366,
 369
 Social Science Association, I, 3, 4,
 99
 Sofia, 26, 32, 46, 189-194, 333
 Spooner, Dr., 371
 Stambul, 47, 128, 142, 162, 163,
 173, 175, 186, 236, 251, 259, 260,
 265, 266, 270, 276, 277, 281, 283,
 288, 313, 315, 337, 348, 356, 357,
 372
 Stambuloff, S. N., 13, 189-194
Standard, The, 181-183
 Stanhope, Lady Hester, 74
 Stanley, E. P. (Dean), 69, 70, 121
 Stavrides, Mr. (Dragoman at British
 Embassy), 47, 48
 Stoiloff, Mr., 13, 191
 Stone, Sir Benjamin, 70
 Strangford, Lady, 23, 131
 Stratford de Redcliffe, Lady, 95, 96
 Stratford de Redcliffe, Lord, 46, 47,
 52, 124, 152
 Street, G. E., 101
 Suchon, Admiral, 342, 348, 352
 Suez, 89
 Suliman Pasha, 32, 33
 Surtees, Colonel, 336, 337
 Switzerland, 189
 Syria, 132, 341, 343, 370

 TABAH, III, 113, 114, 213, 215
 Tachsin Bey, III, 112, 241
 Tahir Bey, 286
 Tait, Archbishop, 121
 Talaat Bey, 299, 304, 340, 341, 347,
 353, 355, 357
Tanin, The, 267
 Tarler, Mr., Secretary at the
 American Embassy, 362
 Tartar Bazarjik, 19
 Taxim, 278
 Tel-el-Kebir, 89
Temps, Le, 37
 Tewfik Bey, 66
 Tewfik, Khedive of Egypt, 78, 87-
 90, 122, 215
 Tewfik Pasha, 244, 266, 296
 Therapia, 93, 210, 238
 Thornton, Sir Edward, 134-136
 Thrace, 60, 311, 327, 335, 337,
 348
Times, The, 16, 20, 27, 28, 36, 44,
 126, 330
 Tirnovo, 193
 Tokar, 94

 Tripoli, 323, 324
 Troy, 62, 65
Truth, 17
 Tunis, 110, 293
 Turkey, Sultan of, *see* Abdul Aziz,
 Murad V., Abdul Hamid, Abdul
 Medjid, and Mahomet V.
 Turkish feeling against Christians,
 46-49
 Turkish Finance, 52, 53

 UNIFORMS, Military, 30
 United States, 135, 136, 161, 171,
 172, 299, 336
 Urfa, 161, 344
 Urquhart, Mr., Philo-Turk, 6, 75
 Uskub, 254, 255, 326

 VAMBERY, Arminius, 108, 124-130
 Van Millingen, Dr. Alexander, 94,
 179, 356, 370
 Venezelos, M., 350
 Venice, 81, 151
 Verestchagin, V., 30
 Vessel Pasha, 26
 Victoria, Queen, 181, 216, 219
 Vienna, 21, 33, 43, 75, 129, 150, 323
 Villehardouin, Marshal, 240
 Vinicombe Pasha, Colonel, 337

 WALES, Prince of, *see* Edward VII.
 Wallace, Sir Donald Mackenzie,
 330
 Walsh, Dr., *Two Years in Con-*
stantinople, 64, 290
 Wangenheim, Baron von, 342, 344,
 352, 355
 Waring Guard, The, 179, 240
 Washburn, Dr. George, 13, 14, 16,
 17, 21, 58, 59, 94, 137, 159
 Washington, U.S.A., 134
 Washington, Rev. George, 94
 Watson, Sir Charles, 370
 Wellesley, Lord Gerald, 345
 White, Dr., 341
 White, Sir William, 30, 31, 107,
 136-139, 144, 145, 148, 149,
 346
 White Slave Traffic, 130-132, 254
 Whitehouse, Canon, 123
 Whittaker, Mr., editor of *Levant*
Herald, 115
 Whittall, Sir William, 261, 262
 Wigram, Rev. Dr., 364
 Wilhelm II., 216, 244, 245, 330,
 351
 Williams, Admiral, 173, 324

Wilson, Sir Charles, 370
 Wolff, Sir H. Drummond, 108-110,
 144, 214
 Wolseley, Sir Garnet, 89, 92, 93
 Wood, Mr. (English merchant at
 Smyrna), 62, 63
 Woods, Charles H., 298
 Wordsworth, Bishop, 178, 179,
 370
 Wylie, Colonel Doughty, 298
 Wynckler, Otto, 369

YANINA, 332
 Yemen, 306
 Yildiz, 139-143, 222, 224, 228-230,
 232-234, 236, 237, 247, 255, 256,
 261, 266, 276, 278-281, 284-287,
 301, 302
 Young Men's Christian Association
 in Constantinople, 364
 Yumur Talik, 67
 ZOHRAE, Mr., 299

INDIAN MEMORIES

Recollections of Soldiering, Sport, etc. By LIEUT.-GENERAL SIR ROBERT BADEN-POWELL, K.C.B. With 24 Illustrations in Colour and 100 in Black and White by the Author. Demy 8vo (9 by $5\frac{3}{4}$ inches). Price 12/6 net. Inland Postage 6d. Foreign, 1/-.

SUNDAY TIMES.—"Get hold of this delightful book of 'B.-P.'s' as soon as you can."

DAILY CHRONICLE.—"A book good to ramble through."

WESTMINSTER GAZETTE.—"A book that is sure to interest a multitude of readers."

DAILY NEWS.—"What a refreshing and interesting volume 'B.-P.' has given to readers in need of being cheered up."

STANDARD.—"An entirely delightful collection of reminiscences . . . we advise our readers to get it, read it, and enjoy it."

ST. JAMES'S GAZETTE.—"Take up this book when you are feeling slack and dull. Its matter-of-fact briskness will infect you."

PALL MALL GAZETTE.—"In these entertaining reminiscences there are glimpses of mystery and romance, which flee like the rainbow when we attempt to extract them."

TIMES.—"Sir Robert Baden-Powell's 'Indian Memories' are so varied and entertaining that, whichever of them one selects to write about, others equally tempting must be omitted."

DAILY MAIL.—"His book is bright and cheerful and full of the joy of life. Its pleasant, healthy pages are illustrated by the author's own clever sketches in black and white and colour."

DAILY GRAPHIC.—"Exceedingly instructive and entertaining. It is not merely that his lively pen is here seen at its best, but that in addition he has given us a whole gallery of admirable pictures, many in colour, to enforce his text. Many of the colour drawings are instinct with beauty, while the sketches in black and white are full of humour."

OBSERVER.—"Whether the author is writing of Army training or practical jokes, of native servants or fever cures, of the Kaiser or mad mules, he shows an unfailing sense of human interest as well as the faculty of setting it in the aptest, vividest, directest form."

HERBERT JENKINS LIMITED
12 ARUNDEL PLACE HAYMARKET S.W.

MY RECOLLECTIONS

Of Australia and Elsewhere. 1842-1914. By the HON. JOHN MILDRED CREED, M.D., Member of the Legislative Council, N.S.W. With 16 Illustrations. Demy 8vo. 16/- net. Inland Postage 6d. extra.

For the last forty years the Hon. John Mildred Creed has been a prominent figure in Australian politics, and during that time he has met all the leading politicians as well as the distinguished personalities who have visited Australia. His book teems with anecdotes of well-known people, and so wide is his interest and knowledge that few volumes in recent years have dealt with such varied topics and subjects. For instance, one chapter deals with the horse in Australia, a second with bush-rangers, and a third with the Costa Rica Packet Case. Among his good stories are two of King George V. that will be new to most people.

UP AND DOWN THE WORLD

By a Passionate Pilgrim. With 16 Full-page Illustrations. Demy 8vo. Price 10/6 net. Inland Postage 6d. extra.


This book contains the reminiscences of a remarkable woman, who prefers to preserve her anonymity, although she is known as a writer of charming books. Her recollections have a quaint old-world charm, particularly those dealing with the narrow Scotch atmosphere in which she was brought up. She has the power of giving vivid impressions of her surroundings, and she has been fortunate alike in her friendships and in her travels. There are portraits in the book which will be easily recognisable, and throughout the whole there is a delicate and subtle humour.


A KING'S FAVOURITE

A Study Based upon Unpublished Documents. By CLAUDE SAINT-ANDRÉ. With an Introduction by PIERRE DE NOLHAC, and 16 Illustrations. Demy 8vo. 12/6 net. Inland Postage 6d. extra.

HERBERT JENKINS LIMITED
12 ARUNDEL PLACE HAYMARKET S.W.







- 7 → justified behavior of Turkey
→ Turkey only better in Europe Theory
→ Turkey not front for as best as Christian
3 → why the Turk is discredited

Assess how he lived under Ottoman regime
9 → he is way off re: how Turkey rule Middle East

Early News → Fred Plc → Marathon
AN .67L84045

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

Pears, Sir Edwin
Forty years in
Constantinople

